Vol. XXXV. JANUARY, 1958. No. 1

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

ALMA COLLEGE
P
LIBRARY
AUCR
Los Gatos, Calif.

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

50499

V. 35
1958

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. Cunningham, V.G., Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 1
Encyclical on centenary of Lourdes—Declaration of S.C. of Rites on form of vestments—Ruling of S.C. of Propaganda on readmission to seminaries.

THE THEOLOGY OF MYSTERIES,
Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 15

THE BACKGROUND AND MEANING OF THE BIBLICAL FLOOD NARRATIVE, II ..... Rev. William Dalton, S.J. 23

MORAL THEOLOGY,
Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 40
Attendance at Afternoon Mass—Note on Afternoon Masses.

CANON LAW .... Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 45
Non-Catholics and matrimonial impediments.

LITURGY .... Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 53
Some Notes on Holy Week.

HOMILETICS .... Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 63
The Lessons of Lourdes.

NOTES 74
The Nature and Method of Sacred Theology (Rev. Ignatius O'Brien, O.P.).

BOOK REVIEWS 82
Autobiographical Writings (Newman); Towards Evening (Hope); The Catholic Priest in the Modern World (Magner); An Introduction to Philosophy (Sullivan); Philosophical Psychology (Donceel); The Elements of Logic (Smith); The Thing (Chesterton); Message of the Mass (Perez); The Church Teaches; A Right to be Merry (Sister M. Frances); Coventry Patmore (Oliver); Citeaux and her Elder Daughters (King).

SHORT NOTICES 52, 62

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Januarii, 1958.

Official Documents

ENCYCLICAL

To the Cardinals and Bishops of France on the Centenary of the Apparitions of the Immaculate Virgin Mary at Lourdes.

PIUS XII, POPE.

Very Dear Sons and Venerable Brethren—health and apostolic blessing.

The pilgrimage to Lourdes, which We had the joy of making, when We went as Legate of Our Predecessor Pius XI, to preside over the Eucharistic and Marian celebrations held for the closure of the Jubilee of Redemption, did indeed leave a profound and sweet impression on Our soul. It is consequently very pleasing to Us to learn that, on the initiative of the Bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes, the City of Mary is preparing to celebrate with due splendour the Centenary of the Apparitions of the Immaculate Virgin in the grotto of Massabielle. An International Committee has been constituted under the presidency of His Eminence Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Dean of the Sacred College. Together with you, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, We are moved to thank God for the wonderful favour granted to your country and for the torrents of graces poured out during a century on multitudes of pilgrims. We desire, likewise, to invite all Our children to renew, during this jubilee year, their confident and generous piety towards Her, who, according to the word of St. Pius X, deigned to establish at Lourdes "the throne of her immense goodness."

I

Every Christian land is Mary's land, and there is no people redeemed by the blood of Christ which does not love to proclaim Mary their Mother and their Patroness. This truth, however, has a most striking relevance when we consider the history of France. The cultus of the Mother of God goes back to the beginnings of

its evangelization and, amongst the ancient sanctuaries of Mary, Chartres still draws pilgrims in great numbers, and it draws thousands of young people. The Middle Age, which, notably with St. Bernard, sang the glories of Mary and celebrated her mysteries, witnessed that really wonderful efflorescence of French Cathedrals dedicated to Our Lady: the Cathedrals of Notre Dame du Puy, of Rheims, Amiens, Paris and so many others. . . . They announce the glory of the Immaculate from afar by their soaring spires; they show it forth in the pure light of their stained-glass windows and in the harmonious beauty of their statues; they attest especially the faith of a people lifting themselves above themselves in a magnificent endeavour to fix in the sky of France the permanent homage of its piety towards Mary.

In cities and country places, on the tops of hills or overlooking the sea, the sanctuaries consecrated to Mary—humble chapels or splendid basilicas—gradually covered the country with the shadow of their protection. Princes and Pastors and faithful innumerable have made their way throughout the centuries to those shrines to honour the Blessed Virgin, saluting her with the most expressive titles inspired by their confidence and their gratitude. In one place she is invoked as Our Lady of Mercy, in another as Universal Help or Bon Secours; here she is the refuge of pilgrims as Notre Dame de la Garde, as Our Lady of Pity or of Consolation; there the pilgrim's prayer ascends to Our Lady of Light, of Peace, of Joy, of Hope. She is also implored as Our Lady of Virtues, of Miracles, of Victories. Such an admirable Litany of titles, innumerable and never exhausted, tell, from province to province, of the benefits which the Mother of God in the course of the ages, has showered down on the land of France.

The nineteenth century, however, after the tortured period of the revolution, was to be, in many ways, the century of Mary's predilections. To cite one fact only, who does not know the "Miraculous Medal?" Revealed in the very heart of the French capital to a humble daughter of St. Vincent de Paul, whom We had the joy of inscribing on the catalogue of the Saints, this medal, struck with the image of "Mary conceived without sin," has spread spiritual and material prodigies everywhere. And, some years later, from February 11 to July 16, 1858, it pleased the Blessed Virgin, by a new favour, to manifest

herself in the country of the Pyrenees to a pious and pure child of a Christian family that knew toil and poverty. As We said on April 28, 1935, at Lourdes: "She came to Bernadette, she made the child her confidant, her co-worker, the instrument of her maternal tenderness and of the merciful omnipotence of her Son, to restore the world in Christ by a new and incomparable effusion of Redemption."

The events which then occurred at Lourdes, the true spiritual proportions of which can be better measured to-day, are well known to you. You know, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, in what an astonishing way, in spite of scoffings, doubts and opposition, the voice of that child, the messenger of the Immaculate, has imposed itself on the world. You know the firmness and sincerity of her testimony, wisely approved by episcopal authority and sanctioned by the same authority from 1862 on. Already the crowds had gathered and they have never ceased to flow to the grotto of the apparitions and to the miraculous spring in the sanctuary raised at the request of Mary. One sees the moving procession of the lowly, the sick and the afflicted; one sees the imposing pilgrimage of thousands of faithful from a diocese or from a nation; one witnesses the timid approach of a disturbed soul seeking the truth. . . . As we said on that occasion (April, 1935): "Never in any place on earth has such a procession of suffering been seen, never such a radiation of peace, of serenity and of joy." And We could have added: Never shall we know the sum total of benefits which the world owes to the Virgin of succour—"*O specus felix decorate divae / Matris aspectu! Veneranda rupes / unde vitales scatuere pleno / gurgite lymphae!*"

Those hundred years of honour for Mary have, moreover, knitted between the See of Peter and the sanctuary of the Pyrenees close bonds of union, which We are pleased to recognize. Really, the Virgin Mary herself has desired those rapprochements. "The dogma which the Sovereign Pontiff, by his infallible magisterium had defined, the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, blessed amongst all women, wished, it seems, to confirm by the word of her mouth, when, a few years later, she manifested herself by a celebrated apparition at the grotto of Massabielle." Of course, the infallible word of the Roman Pontiff, authentic interpreter of revealed truth, had no need of heavenly confirmation to make it accepted by the faithful; nevertheless

it was with lively emotion and new gratitude that the Christian people and its pastors received from the lips of Bernadette that answer which came from heaven: "I am the Immaculate Conception."

It is no wonder, then, that Our Predecessors wished to multiply their favours towards this sanctuary. From 1869 Pius IX, of holy memory, rejoiced in the fact that the obstacles raised against Lourdes by the malice of men had only served to give "more manifestation and more strength of evidence to the clear fact." Strong in this assurance he heaped spiritual benefits on the newly erected church and had the statue of Our Lady of Lourdes solemnly crowned. Leo XIII, in 1892, granted the proper Office and Mass of the feast *in apparitione Beatae Mariae Virginis Immaculatae,* which his successor was soon to extend to the universal Church. A new application was thus given to the ancient scriptural invitation: *Surge, amica mea, speciosa mea, et veni: columba mea in foraminibus petrae, in caverna maceriae!* (Cant. 2: 13f.). Towards the end of his life the same great Pontiff, Leo XIII, inaugurated and blessed, himself personally, the reproduction of the grotto of Massabielle erected in the Vatican Gardens, and at the same time his voice was raised to the Virgin of Lourdes in a prayer full of ardour and confidence, "that the power of the Virgin Mother, who once co-operated by her love in the birth of the faithful in the Church, might still be the instrument and guardian of our salvation . . . that she might give back the tranquility of peace to troubled souls; that she might finally hasten, in private and in public life, the return of men to Jesus Christ."

The Cinquantenary of the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin offered St. Pius X the occasion to attest in a solemn document the historical link between that act of the Magisterium and the apparition of Lourdes. This is what he wrote: "Scarcely had Pius IX defined it to be of Catholic faith that Mary was from the first moment exempt from original sin, than the Virgin herself began to work wonders at Lourdes" (Encycl. *Ad diem illum,* Feb. 2, 1904). A little later he created the new episcopal title of Lourdes, attaching it to that of Tarbes, and he signed the introduction of the Cause of Bernadette's beatification. It was reserved especially to this great Pope of the Eucharist to underline and favour the admirable union that exists at Lourdes between the cult of the

Eucharist and prayer to Mary. "Piety towards the Mother of God," he noted, "stirs up and promotes at Lourdes a remarkable and ardent piety towards Christ Our Lord" (July 12, 1914). Could it really be otherwise? Everything in Mary carries us towards her Son, the one and only Saviour, through whose foreseen merits she was immaculate and full of graces; everything in Mary lifts us to the praise of the adorable Trinity, and happy, indeed, was Bernadette, who while counting her beads in front of the grotto, learned from the lips and the look of the Holy Virgin to give glory to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit. Hence We are happy, in this Centenary, to associate Ourselves with this eulogy of St. Pius X: "The unique glory of the sanctuary of Lourdes resides in this fact, that from all parts the peoples are drawn by Mary to the adoration of Christ Jesus in the August Sacrament, so that this sanctuary, being at once a centre of devotion to Mary and a throne of the Eucharistic mystery, surpasses, it seems, in glory all the other sanctuaries in the Catholic world" (April 25, 1911).

This sanctuary, already highly enriched with favours, Benedict XV further enriched with new and precious indulgences, and, although the tragic circumstances of his Pontificate did not permit him to multiply public acts of his devotion, he graciously honoured the City of Mary by according to its Bishop the privilege of the pallium at the place of the apparitions. Pius XI, who had himself been a pilgrim at Lourdes, followed up the record, and had the joy of raising to the altars the privileged child of the Virgin. He beatified and canonised Bernadette, who, under the religious veil was known as Sister Mary Bernard of the Congregation of Charity and Christian Instruction. Thereby he set the seal of authenticity, so to speak, on the promise of the Immaculate to the young girl Bernadette, that she would make her "happy not in this world but in the next." Now it is also Nevers, which has the honour of holding the shrine of Bernadette's body, that draws many of the pilgrims who go to Lourdes. They come to Nevers with the desire of learning from the Saint how to receive the message of Our Lady. Soon after the canonization of Bernadette, Pius XI, who, like his Predecessors, had already participated through a Legate in the anniversary celebration of the apparitions, decided to close the Jubilee of Redemption at the grotto of Massabielle. He chose this place because, as he had previously said, it was there "that

the Immaculate Virgin Mary showed herself several times to Blessed Bernadette Soubirous, there too she exhorted all men to penance, there finally, in the scene of a marvellous apparition, she lavished graces and miracles." "Truly," concluded the Pontiff, "this sanctuary now justly claims to be one of the principal sanctuaries of Mary in the whole world."

To this unanimous concert of praises We could not fail to unite Our voice. We did so particularly in Our Encyclical *Fulgens Corona,* recalling, like Our Predecessors, that the Blessed Virgin Mary herself willed, it seems, to confirm by a miracle the sentence which the Vicar of her divine Son on earth had recently proclaimed amidst the applause of the whole Church. We also remarked on that occasion that the Roman Pontiffs, conscious of the importance of the pilgrimage to Lourdes, had never ceased to "enrich the sanctuary with spiritual favours and testimonies of their benevolence."

The history of those hundred years, which We have barely sketched, offers constant evidence of the Papal favour towards Lourdes, the last act of which was the closure at this sanctuary of the Centenary of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception. But to you especially, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, We wish to recall a recent Document, by which we favoured the development of a missionary apostolate in your dear country. In that Document We evoked "the singular merits which France acquired in the spread of the Catholic Faith throughout the centuries," and on this account "We turned Our mind and heart towards Lourdes, where four years after the definition of the dogma, the Immaculate Virgin herself confirmed supernaturally by apparitions, messages and miracles, the declaration of the Supreme Teacher" (Constit. Ap. *Omnium Ecclesiarum,* Aug. 15, 1954).

Today, once more, We turn to the celebrated sanctuary, which is preparing to receive, on the banks of the Gave, the pilgrims of the Centenary. If, during the century, ardent supplications, public and private, have at Lourdes obtained from God, by the intercession of Mary, so many graces of healing and conversion, We have firm confidence that, in this jubilee year, Our Lady will respond with lavish willingness to the expectations of her children. Surely so, but We have especially the conviction that she is pressing us to gather the spiritual lessons of the

apparitions and thus follow the way she so clearly marked out for us.

II

These lessons are a faithful echo of the Gospel message. They bring out most strikingly the contrast between the judgments of God and the vain wisdom of this world. In a society which is scarcely conscious of the evils which are gnawing at it, which veils its miseries and injustices under a mask of prosperity, brilliance and care-freeness, the Immaculate Virgin, whom sin never touched, manifested herself to an innocent child. With maternal compassion she gazes over this world ransomed by the blood of her Son, where, alas! sin is making such ravages every day, and three times over she launches her pressing appeal: "Penance, penance, penance." Even expressive gestures manifesting the spirit of penance are demanded from Bernadette: "Go and kiss the ground in penance for sinners." And to gesture supplication also must be joined: "You will pray to God for sinners." Thus, as in the time of John the Baptist, as at the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus, the same injunction, strong and severe, dictates to men the way of return to God: "Do penance." And who will dare to say that this appeal to conversion of heart has lost its actuality in our day?

But the Mother of God could not come to her children except as a messenger of pardon and hope. That water, which flows at her feet, recalls the prophetic words: *"Omnes sitientes, venite ad aquas, et haurietis salutem a Domino."* To this spring, to which the docile Bernadette first went to drink and wash, all the miseries of soul and body will come. As the blind man in St. John's Gospel said: "I went, and I washed and I received my sight." The grateful pilgrim to Lourdes can make this word his own. But there is more. As of old for the crowds that pressed around Jesus, the healing of physical ills is not only an exhibition of mercy but is also the sign of the power which the Son of Man has to forgive sins (Mark 2:10). At the hallowed grotto the Blessed Virgin invites us, in the name of her divine Son to conversion of heart and to the hope of pardon. Are we going to listen to her?

In that humble response of man acknowledging that he is a sinner the true grandeur of this jubilee year consists. What benefits could we not expect for the Church if each pilgrim to

Lourdes—and every Christian united in heart to the celebrations of the Centenary—realised first and foremost in himself this work of sanctification "not in words only and with his tongue, but in actuality and reality." In any case, everything invites that way, for nowhere as at Lourdes does one feel carried along in a stream of prayer, of forgetfulness of self and of charity. The devotedness of the brancardiers, the serene peace of the sick, the fraternity which gathers into one common voice of invocation the faithful from everywhere, the spontaneity of mutual help, the unaffected fervour of pilgrims kneeling at the grotto—at the sight of these things the better souls are caught in the attraction of a life more totally given to the service of God and of neighbour, the less fervent become conscious of their lukewarmness and find once more the way of prayer, the more hardened sinners and even the unbelieving are often touched by grace, or, at least, if they are honest, they do not remain insensible to the testimony of "this multitude of believers having only one heart and one soul."

In itself alone, however, the experience of a few, short days of pilgrimage is not for the most part sufficient to engrave indelibly on the heart the appeal of Mary for a real spiritual conversion. Hence We exhort the pastors of dioceses and all priests to a rivalry of zeal, in order that the pilgrims of the Centenary may have the benefit of a good preparation, a solid realisation and especially a subsequent following-up, which will be as propitious as possible, in furthering the profound and lasting action of grace. Return to regular frequentation of the Sacraments, to respect for Christian morality in all departments of life, to participation in Catholic Action and in the various works recommended by the Church—these are the things that will make the important movement of crowds to Lourdes during 1958 correspond to the intentions of the Immaculate Virgin. On these conditions the Centenary will produce the fruits of salvation so necessary for humanity at this time.

Primary as it is, the individual conversion of the pilgrim cannot be sufficient. In this jubilee year We exhort you, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, to stir up amongst the faithful committed to your care a collective effort to bring about Christian renewal throughout society. This must be the response to Mary's appeal. As Pius XI demanded at the Marian festivals of the Jubilee of Redemption: "Let souls that are blinded . . . be

illuminated with the light of truth and justice; let those who are wandering in error be brought back to the right road; let just liberty be everywhere granted to the Church; let an era of concord and true prosperity dawn for all peoples" (January 10, 1935).

Now the world, which offers in our day so many lawful motives of the pride of progress and of hope, is also exposed to a formidable temptation—the temptation of materialism often denounced by Our Predecessors and by Ourselves. This materialism is not solely that which reigns in the condemned philosophy that presides over the political and economic life of a portion of mankind; it is a fever that rages also in the love of money, and its ravages are measured by the vastness of modern enterprises, commanding alas! many deliberate decisions that weigh heavily on the life of peoples; such materialism also shows itself in the cult of the body, the excessive quest of comfort, and flight from all austerity of life; it pushes people to undervalue human life, that life which is destroyed before it sees the light; it manifests itself in the unrestrained pursuit of pleasure—a pleasure-seeking which scoffs at purity and even tries to seduce, in various ways, the hearts of the pure by such means as readings and spectacles; such materialism is likewise present in indifference to one's neighbour, in the egoism which crushes him, in the injustice which deprives him of his rights, in a word, in that conception of life which regulates everything in view of material prosperity alone and the satisfactions of earth. "My soul," said a rich man, "you have a quantity of good things laid up for many years; take your ease, eat, drink, and enjoy yourself. But God said to him: Thou fool, this very night thy soul will be demanded from thee" (Lk. 12:19f).

To a society which, in its public life, often usurps the supreme rights of God and which would gain the world at the price of the soul, the Virgin Mother launches a cry of alarm. Attentive to her appeal, let priests boldly and fearlessly preach to all the great truths of salvation. There is no lasting renewal but that founded on the inviolable principles of the faith, and it is the task of priests to form the conscience of the Christian people. Just as the Immaculate, compassionate as she is towards our miseries, but fully aware of our real needs, comes to men to recall the essential and austere ways of religious conversion,

so priests, as ministers of the word of God, must, with a truly supernatural assurance, mark out for souls the narrow road which leads to life. They shall do so without forgetting what spirit of mildness and patience should animate them, but without veiling anything that the Gospel demands. In the school of Mary they will learn to live for nothing else but to give Christ to the world, but also, if necessary, they will be ready to wait with faith for the hour of Jesus and keep stand at the foot of the cross.

Gathered around their priests, the faithful must collaborate in this effort of renewal. In the place where Providence has set him, who is there who cannot do more for the cause of God?

Our thoughts turn to the great number of consecrated souls, who in the Church devote themselves to innumerable works of beneficence. Their vows of religion bind them more than others to struggle victoriously, under the aegis of Mary, against the immoderate appetites of independance, riches and enjoyment that flood the world; besides, at Mary's appeal they will exert themselves in opposing the assault of evil by the weapons of prayer and penance, and by the victories of charity.

Our thoughts turn also to Christian families which We conjure to remain faithful to their irreplaceable mission in society. Let them consecrate themselves in this jubilee year to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. This act of piety will be for married couples a precious spiritual aid in the practice of the duties of chastity and conjugal fidelity; it will keep purity as the atmosphere of the home in which the children are growing up; more still, it will make of the family, thus alive with devotion to Mary, a living cell of social regeneration and of apostolic penetration.

Indeed, outside of the ambit of the family, professional and civic relations also offer to Christians concerned with the renewal of society a considerable field of activity. Gathered at the feet of the Holy Virgin and docile to her exhortations, they will first of all cast an exacting look on themselves, ready to extirpate from their conscience false judgements, and egoistic reactions. They will fear lest they should be merely putting up a lying appearance of the love of God, a counterfeit not translated into effective love of neighbour. They will seek, Christians of all classes and of all nations, to meet each other in truth and

charity, and to banish misunderstandings and suspicions. No one will deny it—enormous, indeed, is the weight of the social structures and economic pressures which rest heavily on the good will of men and often paralyze it. But, if it is true, as Our Predecessors and Ourselves have emphatically and insistently said, that the question of social and political peace is first of all, in man, a moral question, no reform can be fruitful, no agreement can be stable, without a change and purification of hearts. The Virgin of Lourdes reminds everyone of this in the Jubilee Year.

And if, in her solicitude, Mary bends down with predilection towards some of her children, is it not, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, the little ones, the poor and the sick that are thus privileged—those same little ones that Jesus loved so much? She seems to say with her divine Son: "Come to me, all you who are labouring and are heavily burdened, and I will refresh you." Go to her, you whom material misery is crushing while you are left without defence against the rigours of life and the indifference of men; go to her, you on whom bereavements and moral trials are inflicting heavy blows; go to her, you, dear victims of sickness and infirmity, for you are really received and honored at Lourdes as the suffering members of Our Lord; go to her and obtain peace of heart, strength to meet daily duties, the joy of sacrifice offered. The Immaculate Virgin, who knows the secret ways of grace in souls and the silent action of that supernatural ferment that works in the world, knows also full well how precious in the eyes of God your sufferings are, united to those of the Saviour. They can work powerfully, for this Christian renewal of society which We implore from God through the potent intercession of His Mother. At the prayer of the sick, of the lowly, of all the pilgrims may the Virgin Mother turn her eyes towards those who still remain outside of the one sheepfold of the Church, to gather them together in unity. May she look on those who are seeking and who have a thirst for truth, to lead them to the fountain of living waters. May she cast her gaze over the immense continents and vast human zones where Christ is so little known, so little loved, and may she obtain for the Church the liberty and the joy of responding, as the ever-young, holy and apostolic Bride of Christ, to the expectations of men.

"Would you have the goodness to come . . ." said the Blessed

Virgin to Bernadette. This discreet invitation, which involves no constraint, which is addressed to the heart and solicits with delicacy a free and generous response, the Mother of God addresses once more to her children of France and of the world. Without imperious imposition, she presses them to reform themselves and to work with all their strength for the salvation of the world. Christians will not give a deaf ear to this appeal; they will go to Mary. To each and every one of them We would repeat, at the end of this Letter, the words of St. Bernard: *"In periculis, in angustiis, in rebus dubiis, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca . . . Ipsam sequens, non devias; ipsam rogans, non desperas; ipsam cogitans, non erras; ipsa tenente, non corruis; ipsa protegente, non metuis; ipsa duce, non fatigaris; ipsa propitia, pervenis . . ."* (Hom. 2 Super *Missus est.*)

We are quite confident, dear Sons and Venerable Brethren, that Mary will hear your prayer and Ours. We are asking her on this feast of the Visitation, which is well adapted to celebrate also that visit which, a century ago, she deigned to bestow on the land of France. In inviting you to sing to God, with the Immaculate Virgin, the Magnificat of your gratitude, We call down on yourselves and your faithful, on the sanctuary of Lourdes and its pilgrims, on all those who carry the responsibility of the Centenary celebrations the most copious outpouring of graces. And as a pledge of that abundant effusion, We grant you most cordially, with constant and paternal benevolence, Our Apostolic Blessing.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on the Feast of the Visitation of the Most Holy Virgin, the 2nd of July of the year 1957, of Our Pontificate the nineteenth

PIUS XII POPE.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

DECLARATION

CONCERNING QUERY ON THE FORM OF VESTMENTS.

Many Bishops and ecclesiastics have repeatedly asked the Holy See to give a ruling on the Response given by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on December 9, 1925. This Response regarded vestments for Mass and sacred functions having the old shape. To the query whether such vestments may be made

and used, this Sacred Congregation of Rites now declares that it is left to the prudent judgement of local Ordinaries to decide whether, in view of special and local circumstances, these vestments may be permitted or not.

The local Ordinaries should, however, take care, in judging this matter, that great consideration is given to the holiness and seemliness of divine worship. They should not allow any rash and ill-advised departure from the approved discipline regarding the shape of the vestments; they should rather prohibit sedulously such changes as cause disturbance or are a subject of astonished surprise to the faithful.

Rome, August 20, 1957,

C. Card. CICOGNANI, Prefect.

✠ A. CARINCI, Abp. of Seleucia, Secretary.

COMMUNICATION

FROM THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE

In a report dated September 19, 1957, His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate asked the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide if the Decree of the S.C. of Seminaries and Universities, regarding the re-admission to Diocesan Seminaries of students who had been sent away from some seminary or had left of their own accord, applied to countries under Propaganda. His Excellency sends us the following reply recently received by him. It was given under date October 28, 1957.

"My Lord Archbishop,

"Regarding the report N.754/57 sent by Your Excellency asking, in the name of the Most Reverend Ordinaries of your Apostolic Delegation if the Decree published by the S.C. of Seminaries and Universities under date 12 July, 1957 [*A.C.R.*, Oct., 1957], applies also to the territories under the jurisdiction of the S.C. de Propaganda Fide."

The question was discussed at the meeting of the Sacred Congregation held on October 25. The decision was that the

above-mentioned Decree does not oblige in the territories depending on Propaganda.

I willingly take advantage of this occasion to express to you sentiments of cordial appreciation and remain

Your Excellency's Devoted Servant in our Lord,

P. Card. FUMASONI BIONDI, Prefect.

✠ P. SIGISMONDI, Secretary.

W. LEONARD,

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

The Theology Of Mysteries

This year marks the tenth anniversary of the death of Odo Casel, the distinguished Benedictine monk of Maria Laach. The words which announced his sudden death to the world contain a brief phrase which can serve to define his place in modern theology—*sacri mysterii cultor et mystagogus.* Dom Casel is, above all else, the theologian of the Christian Mystery. This was the theme of the thesis which he defended at the Benedictine College of St. Anselm in 1912, and which he expounded and developed up till his death in 1948. The purpose of this article is to present our readers with an outline of Casel's theology which is characterised by its great richness and breadth of vision. It is a theology of the redemptive life of Christ, a theology of the liturgy, a theology of the sacraments in general, a theology of the sacrifice of the Mass. All in all, it is a complete synthesis of Christianity.[1]

To appreciate the originality of Casel's position we must understand something of the intellectual climate which existed prior to the first world war. The comparative study of religion had brought to light some striking analogies between the pagan mystery cults and the Christian liturgy. Liberal theologians had exploited these similarities in order to destroy the foundations of Christian life. The divine origin of the sacraments was called into question. In particular, the great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist were presented as derivations and modifications of the pagan rites of initiation.

These were the circumstances under which Odo Casel began his studies of the Christian mysteries. He adopted a courageous procedure. He accepted all the evidence brought forward by the comparative school, and turned it to a defence of Christianity.

The pagan mysteries have a common basic pattern. Each of them is a kind of religious drama. Each of them is a ritual presentation of the death and resurrection of a god. The followers of the god take part in a religious rite which associates them with

---

[1]The best survey of the entire controversy on the theology of mysteries is to be found in the doctorate thesis of Th. Filthaut, La Theologie des Mysteres, Desclee, 1954. In the course of the present article the actual words of Filthaut, and Casel himself, are sometimes quoted without further acknowledgment. This procedure has been adopted to avoid overloading the text with foot-notes.

the saving act of the deity. This is the process by which they themselves are saved. They are now considered as born again to a new divine life, the life of the god who triumphed over death.[2]

According to Casel the pagan mystery religions did not influence the beginnings of Christianity. They cannot explain the origins of the Christian mysteries. But they were a providential preparation of humanity for the divine work of salvation. They show how the Christian mystery corresponds to the desires and longings of the human heart. They show how grace perfects nature. What, then, is the Christian Mystery?

THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERY

It is a first principle of the theology of mysteries that men do not become Christians solely by adhering to the doctrines of Christ, and professing the name of Christ. Neither do they become Christians solely by receiving the graces communicated by Christ. To be a Christian, in the fullest sense of the word, demands a real participation in the saving acts of Christ. The Christian life is not simply a matter of believing in Christ, and receiving his grace into our souls. Christians must also share in the redemptive work of Christ. They must come into contact with Christ's mysteries; they must enter into those mysteries and live by them.

To understand how this is possible, we must first understand the nature of the Christian mystery. We must understand the process by which salvation is designed by God, executed by Christ and communicated through the Church. Altogether, we can distinguish three phases of the Christian mystery, the divine mystery.

(i) *The Mystery of God.* In the first place the divine mystery is God Himself. He is infinite, inaccessible, all holy; and no man can see or approach Him. Here, the word mystery expresses the idea of a hidden reality, a reality withdrawn from the sight of men. But the word mystery implies equally a second notion, that of a revelation. It conveys the idea that God cannot be communicated to men except by a mysterious revelation. For Christianity, the great revelation of the hidden God is accomplished through

[2]The meaning, the scope and the religious content of the pagan mystery religions have now been reassessed in the light of a more critical historical method. For a discussion as to the way this affects the position of Casel the reader may consult L. Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, Notre Dame Press, 1955, pp. 86-98.

Christ Jesus, God Incarnate. Hence with Christ we pass to the second phase of the divine mystery, the mystery of Christ.

(ii) *The Mystery of Christ.* From all eternity this mystery was willed by the love of God and foreseen in the plan of God. But it is realised in time and in history by Christ Jesus. The mystery of God Himself is historically manifested and lived in the life of Christ in Palestine.

Christ is, first of all, the mystery in person. He manifests in our human flesh the divinity that we could never see. With him the hidden God, the God who dwells in light inaccessible, has appeared in our human nature. With the Son of God Incarnate we contemplate the divine mystery hidden from the beginning of ages, and now manifested to men. Christ is a revelation in the fullest sense of the word. With him a veil is lifted. The whole life of Christ, His divine-human actions, His theandric actions, are a progressive revelation of the mystery of God. But this is particularly true of his Passion, Death and Resurrection. On the Cross He reveals the infinite love of the Father for men. Thus St. Paul declares: God showed his love for us . . . because Christ Jesus died for us. His resurrection and his ascension are also a revelation of the mystery of God. In these events the divine glory is manifested in the humanity of Christ. Thus Christ Himself is the mystery in person.

But Christ is also the Saviour. Because of sin the mystery of Christ is a mystery of redemption. The mystery of Christ is also a manifestation of the saving act of God.

Each of the saving acts of Christ, considered separately, constitutes a mystery. We speak of the mystery of the Nativity, the mystery of the Passion, the mystery of the Resurrection. But all the saving acts taken together, all the individual mysteries of the historical life of Christ constitute one single work of Salvation. They all form one mystery of Redemption.

Thus Christ is the mystery in person and all His saving acts form one mystery of redemption. Hence in its full sense the mystery of Christ is constituted by the person of Christ and also by His saving work in all its phases. "The notion of the Mystery of Christ embraces at one and the same time the Person of the God-Man and His redemptive work for the salvation of the Church."[3]

---

[3]O. Casel, Le Mystere du Culte dans le Christianisme, Lex Orandi, 1946 pp. 24-25.

(iii) *The Cult-Mystery. The Liturgical Mystery.* The sacraments communicate to men the life of grace which is a communion of life with Christ. But men do not participate in the life of Christ, unless they come into contact with the saving acts of Christ. The reality of salvation is obtained by following the order, the economy, the itinerary of salvation established by Christ. In other words, salvation is obtained by a mystical and real participation in Christ's life, death and resurrection. This becomes clearer if we consider the very act by which we become Christians, the sacrament of baptism, and its relation to the saving life of Christ.

The Son of God became man and saviour on account of sinners. That is why He did not appear in a glorious body but in the flesh of sin, so that the sins of men might die in His own flesh. He carried the sins of men to the cross. With His body, sin was nailed to the cross. With His body, sin died on the cross. This is the concept of the saving death of Christ presented by St. Paul. Christ then rose from the dead, a new man resplendent with glory. His body is no longer the flesh of sin, but His entire humanity is transfigured by the divine glory. The Son of Man has become the Lord, the Kyrios, completely spiritual. To put it into the language of St. Paul, the Son of Man has become the *Kurios Pneumatikos,* transfigured and exalted in glory.

Christ has become glorious and spiritual by His passion and death, His humanity transfigured by the divinity. Now, this is the itinerary of salvation that we too must follow. Christ is our perfect example. He is not merely the model of our moral life, but the exemplary cause to which we must be conformed in our very being. Christ is not only the truth and the life, he is also the way. *Ego sum via.* It is by His Passion that Christ has entered into His glory. We in turn must live that Passion mystically with Christ. We must pass through His Passion to enter into His resurrection. This passage, with Christ, from death to life is accomplished in baptism. The baptised Christian is no longer a man pure and simple. He is no longer the man who was born into this world. He is now a man transformed, a man divinised and spiritualised. He is now a Christian, an alter Christus. Thus salvation is obtained by a real and mystical sharing in Christ's death and resurrection. But this is the essential point. We cannot really share in the saving acts of Christ's life, unless those acts are really present and accessible to us here and now. How can we

participate in the life of Christ, how can we re-live the saving acts with Christ, unless those acts are here and now objectively present? Hence the theology of mysteries professes that the saving acts of Christ are present in the sacraments of the Church.

For Casel, the doctrine that the saving acts of Christ are present in the sacraments is not just a theory, but it pertains to the very essence of Christian life. "The saving acts of Christ are so necessary to the Christian, that he cannot be a true Christian unless he lives those acts with Christ. It is not the doctrine of Christ which makes a Christian. It is not even the simple application of his grace. What makes a Christian is a total identification with the person of Christ, and this is obtained by re-living His life."[4]

This objective presence of the saving acts of Christ in the sacraments pertains to the third phase of the Christian mystery, the cult-mystery. The cult-mystery contains the person of Christ, his work of redemption and the operation of his grace.

(iv) *The relation between the Mystery of Christ and the Cult-Mystery.* There is a very close connection between the liturgical mystery and the mystery of Christ. The liturgical mysteries are an extension, an application of the mystery of Christ. Christ and his saving acts are here and now present under the veils of signs and symbols. The acts of salvation which took place in Palestine under the veil of historical accidents are made present in the sacraments under the veil of signs. The cult-mystery is nothing more or less than the God-Man Himself continuing His saving action here on earth. For this reason Leo the Great declares: "What was visible in our Redeemer has now passed into the sacraments." St. Ambrose, too, addresses these words to his Saviour: "It is in your mysteries that I find you." The liturgical mysteries are simply the sacramental mode of Christ and His work of redemption. The difference between the mystery of Christ and the cult-mystery lies in the mode of being not in the essence.

Thus, Dom Casel distinguishes three essential degrees of the divine mystery: God, Christ, the Church. These three aspects of the Mystery are intimately related. God, invisible by his nature, acts visibly in Christ for the salvation of men; and He makes this activity present in the Church by means of the sacraments. Thus

---

[4]Casel, JLW, VIII, p. 175; cited from Filthaut p. 19.

the members of the Church are brought into contact with Christ and his saving acts so that they might draw life from them. The mystery of Christ is God revealing Himself in the Incarnate Word for the salvation of men. By means of the sacraments the Mystery of Christ is continued throughout the centuries. It is prolonged from one generation to the next until the whole Body of Christ obtains salvation and glory with its Head.

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

In the sacraments salvation is hidden under the veil of material elements and human words. But the primary function of these external rites is not to hide the interior reality of the sacrament, but to manifest it. The sacraments pertain essentially to the order of signs which manifest and reveal their contents. But the sacramental sign is an efficacious sign. The sacrament is certainly an image, but it is an image full of reality. The sacramental signs, says Casel, are heavy with reality. The sacrament always involves the real presence of the reality which it reveals. This is the original sense of the axiom: *sacramenta id efficiunt quod figurant.*

According to its ancient usage the word *efficere* means to make something present in reality. The expression indicates precisely that the saving act of Christ is present under a sacred sign. The external rite of the sacrament manifests the work of our redemption and it contains the work of redemption. To consider that the sacrament contains nothing more than the ultimate effect of sanctification, viz., grace, is to limit both the significance and the content of the Christian sacraments. This exclusive consideration of the sacrament as a sign and cause of grace alone, was introduced into theology by the late scholastics. But it does not correspond to the patristic notion of a sacrament which was far richer and far more comprehensive.

Obviously, there is a radical difference between the sacrament as seen through the eyes of Casel and the sacrament as expounded by conventional theology. The ultimate difference lies in the reality contained by the sacrament. According to the theology of mysteries what exactly does the sacrament contain?

(i) *The sacraments contain Christ Himself.* The glorified person of Christ is contained in the sacraments because Christ is present in the sacraments acting in them. Casel reproaches modern theology for having forgotten this aspect of the Christian

mystery, and for limiting the real presence of Christ to the one sacrament of the Eucharist. Christ is really present in every sacrament, for the sacraments are always the actions of Christ Himself.

Christ is the High-Priest of the New Testament and it is He who confers the sacraments. The sacrament communicates grace to the souls of men, but it does not confer grace independently of the presence of Christ. Whenever a sacrament is conferred Christ Himself is really present. But this active presence of the glorified Christ is not, strictly speaking, the reality made present by the sacrament. It is rather the preliminary condition for the realisation of the saving acts of redemption. It is the glorified Christ who makes His saving acts present in the bosom of the Church and transmits their fruits to the members of His Body. It is through the glorious Christ, the Kurios Pneumatikos, that the Church has access to the historical acts of salvation. This doctrine of the real presence of Christ, acting and operating in the sacraments, is constantly affirmed by the patristic evidence.

(ii) *The sacraments contain the saving acts of Christ.* The central doctrine of Casel's theology insists on the objective and real presence of Christ's saving acts in the liturgical mysteries. The Incarnation, the Death, the Resurrection of Christ are made present and re-actualised in the sacraments. There is a perfect numerical identity between the saving act once performed by Christ in the order of history and the saving act now present in the sacramental order. This is the distinctive element of Casel's theology. For other theologians the saving mysteries of Christ's life are *recalled* in the celebration of the sacraments. They are present in the intentional order. The sacraments are commemorative signs of Christ's Passion but not efficacious signs. With the exception of the Eucharist the sacraments contain the power of Christ's Passion, but the Passion itself is not objectively present in the liturgical mystery. For Casel the Eucharist is the key to the entire sacramental system. The real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist demands the real and objective presence of Christ's Passion. In the Eucharist there is present the *immolated* body of Christ which is received by the faithful as a sacrificial repast. The sacrificial repast presumes the sacrificial act of Christ's Passion. Hence the real presence of Christ and the real presence of His Passion are a mutual complement. But the Eucharist is the model of all the sacraments.

What is true of the Eucharist must also be verified, in an analogous manner, in all the sacraments. Hence every sacrament must objectively contain the saving act of Christ's Passion. Otherwise the Eucharist is removed from the sacramental system and becomes an isolated reality. This doctrine that the Passion of Christ is objectively present in each sacrament does not mean that there is no difference between one sacrament and the other. "Although baptism is not a sacrifice, still it makes present the death of Christ, but in a manner quite different from the Eucharist. The death of Christ is present in baptism not as an objective sacrificial act, accomplished for and by the Christian community through the medium of her priests, but as a saving act, no less objective, but *applied to the individual.*"[5] Thus the Passion of Christ is objectively present in every sacrament, but the formal aspect under which it is present, the purpose for which it is present, even the degree of objectivity itself may differ from sacrament to sacrament.

(iii) *The sacraments contain grace.* The saving acts of Christ are objectively present in the sacraments. They are present independently of the subject who receives the sacrament. Nevertheless they are present for the sanctification of men. *Sacramenta sunt propter homines.*

In the sacraments the mysteries of salvation are made accessible to us so that we can participate in them and their saving power. Grace is certainly communicated by the sacrament, but it is the fruit of the saving act which is present. The sacramental grace flows directly from the redemptive work present in the sacrament.

Hence the sacrament does not simply contain the grace which it confers; but the redemptive work itself. The sacrament does not contain grace, abstracted and isolated from the redemption which is its source. It contains the very saving acts from which the grace emanates.

C. TIERNEY.

St. Patrick's College,
Manly.

(To be continued)

---

[5]Casel, text cited from Ami du Clerge, 1948, p. 597

The Background and Meaning of the Biblical Flood Narrative, II.

Summary:
Division of the text—Commentary—The 'P' Tradition—The 'J' Tradition—Archaeological evidence—Scope and meaning of the Biblical text—Inerrancy—Echoes in the Old and New Testaments.

DIVISION OF THE TEXTS.

On the basis of the evidence given above, critics have justifiably concluded to two sources in the flood narrative. The greater part of the text comes from the later tradition, 'P', which in itself forms a complete account. The rest belongs to the 'J' tradition, which is interwoven into the other, and is in itself incomplete, as it supposes various elements in the story given already in the 'P' account. The simplest way to indicate the division is to list the parts which belong to 'J'. These are 6:5-8; 7:1-5, 7-10, 12, 16b-17, 22-23; 8:2b-3a, 6-13b, 20-22. One can best appreciate the literary composition of the passage if one reads from a text which prints the two traditions in different type, as, for example, in Moffatt's translation of the Bible.

COMMENTARY.

A complete commentary on the text is out of the question here,[15] but some of the more interesting points can be raised. We may start with the name of the hero, Noah, or Noe, the latter being the Greek form, which is borrowed in turn by the Vulgate. According to Gen. 5:29, Noah is given this name by his father Lamech because 'this one shall bring us comfort from our work and from the toil of our hands in the ground which Yahweh cursed.' There is a play upon words here, common in the giving of Hebrew names, depending on the assonance between the name Noah and the word for 'comfort', *niḥam*. Noah was indeed to bring comfort, not so much by his discovery of wine (despite the constant references in the Bible to its cheering effects on the human heart) as by the promise God made to him after the flood that He would never again destroy the race of men in another general disaster. The Fathers of the Church delighted to look beyond the person of Noah, seeing in him

[15]Cf. Lambert, art. cit., pp. 582-596.

rather the type and shadow of the perfect 'comforter' and Saviour who was to come.

The real derivation of the name is uncertain. Some suggest *nûaḥ*, 'to rest'; in the narrative of the flood there are a couple of instances where forms of this word are played upon because of their assonance with the name of Noah. For example, in 8:9, we are told that the dove could find no resting-place, *mānôaḥ*, for its feet. One is tempted to derive the name from the root *nāḥâ*, which retains in Ethiopian the meaning 'to be long'. If this were so, then Noah, 'One whose life is prolonged', would correspond to the Sumerian Ziusudra and the Akkadian Utnapishtim, which both have the same meaning, 'Time of prolonged life'.

THE 'P' TRADITION.

Let us consider now the 'P' tradition. As is customary in this source,[16] the narrative is introduced by the formula, 'These are the generations of . . .' (6:9). We could well translate by: 'This is the story of . . .', which is the actual translation of the new American Catholic version from the Hebrew. We notice, too, the stress laid from the beginning on the uprightness of Noah: he walked with God, even as Henoch (5:22), an expression which implies close intimacy and familiarity.

As in the case of the non-Biblical versions of the story, the details of the ark's construction are revealed by God. The actual word used for 'ark' is *tēbâ*, found in the Bible only here and in Ex. 2:3, 5. In the latter, it is used for the basket, made of papyrus reeds and smeared with bitumen and pitch, in which Moses as a child was exposed. The word may be of Egyptian origin. In the Babylonian account the ordinary word for ship is used. It is unfortunate that the accepted English word, 'ark', is used also of the ark of the covenant. This usage derives from the Vulgate and has no foundation in the original language.

Whatever the original meaning of *tēbâ*, the vessel, according to the Bible, is made of gopher wood. This is perhaps to be identified with 'cypress', *kyparistos* in Greek, which the ancient Phoenicians used in ship building. We read in 6:14b: 'You will make nests in the ark'. This could apply to the various sections for the animals and men to be taken aboard, but an emendation which preserves the consonants of the text is preferable; instead of *kinnîm* we should read *kānîm*, 'reeds'. The meaning would thus be: 'You shall make it secure with reeds'. It is very difficult

[16]Cf. Gen. 2:4; 5:1; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1; 37:2.

to obtain a satisfactory meaning from v. 16. The first part is commonly translated: 'You shall set a roof on the ark'. But the word for 'roof' is otherwise unknown. No good sense can be derived from the second part, which runs literally: 'You shall finish it to a cubit above'.

The word for 'flood' in 6:17, *mabbûl,* is found in the Bible only when applied to this event. Its derivation and precise meaning are uncertain. It is possible that it means 'destruction' from the root *nbl,* and so only accidentally comes to designate in the concrete a flood. The noun is used with the definite article, since this event is something unique: it is *the* flood.

It is worth noting that in 6:19-20 the 'P' tradition makes no distinction between clean and unclean animals. According to its view of history, this distinction began only with the legislation of Moses. Note, too, at the end of the chapter the reference to the full and exact obedience of Noah, who thus enters with Abraham and St. Joseph into the ranks of those heroes of divine revelation who 'hear the word of God and do it'.

To understand the priestly account of the actual source of the flood, we must re-read the description of the world's creation as given by the same tradition. The firmament, or solid dome of the sky, was introduced into the primeval waters, separating those above from those beneath. Then the waters beneath the firmament were collected to form the seas and so separated from the dry land. But it was imagined that the earth itself, a flat disk in form, rested on the unfathomable waters of the deep. This order of God's creating work, by which the dry land is protected from the waters above the firmament and in the abyss below, is now threatened. God had found creation something good as it came from His hand; but now, owing to the sin of man, the earth has become corrupt, and so, without any obvious recurrence to secondary causes, the 'P' narrative represents God as letting the original chaos again engulf the world (7:11).

We are told in 7:20 that the waters rose to such a height that they covered the highest mountain to a depth of 15 cubits (a cubit being about one and a half feet). The point of this detail is understood when we realise that the height of the ark was 30 cubits (6:15), and that it can be supposed that it floated half out of the water, to a depth of 15 cubits. Thus in its movement it would just float free from the top of the highest mountain.

We read in 8:1 that 'God remembered Noah'. This phrase is typical of the 'P' tradition as an expression of goodness and mercy. God closes the channels in the cosmos through which the water was pouring in, and sends a wind to dry the surface of the earth. The Ararat mentioned in 8:4 is the land of Urartu, as it is called in the Assyrian texts, a mountainous region between the river Araxes and Lakes Van and Urmiah, correctly designated by the Vulgate as Armenia. It was this rugged area of lofty mountains, according to the 'P' tradition, that the waters completely covered!

With the exit from the ark, creation, as it were, begins again. Cosmic order has already been re-established, and now the command is given to Noah and his family: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth' (9:1). As at the beginning, man is given dominion over the animal world; but the full original harmony is not restored. In Gen. 1:28-30, God had given mankind dominion over the animal creation, but there was no mention there of fear, of eating flesh; animals and men were to live at peace, and both men and animals were to eat the fruit and plants of the earth. But in our text (9:1-7), God promises that He will put the fear of men in the rest of creation; and, what is more, He gives man the animals, birds and fish to be from now on his food. Explicit reference is made to the former law, which is now extended: 'All that moves and has life will be your food; all this I give you, just as I gave you the green plants'. Later on, according to the priestly tradition, this liberty will be restricted to the eating of living things which belong to the category of the ritural pure. This last modification of the law is to come with the legislation of Sinai.

There is, however, one important restriction which dates from Noah: 'But flesh with its life—that is, its blood—you shall not eat'. For the ancient Hebrew, the life of an animal resided in the blood, and it was reverence for life, which is something essentially divine, that caused him to forbid the eating of blood. It was the same concept that made him consider blood as the necessary instrument in the expiatory rites of sacrifice. This restriction is constantly stressed throughout the history of the chosen people. Ezechiel is particularly strong in his condemnation of its violation: he mentions it as a crime on the level of idolatry, murder and adultery (33:25-26). Even in the early Church the Christians converted from Judaism still have scruples about eating blood, so much so that, at the Council of Jerusalem,

James insists that, to avoid scandal, this prohibition should be extended to the Gentile converts as well (Acts 15:20).

It is likely that the practice of pagan peoples of eating blood and of including this practice in their idolatrous rites had some influence too in the legislation of the Jews. Divination and magic are mentioned in Lev. 19:26 together with the eating of blood.

But the sternest prohibition comes when there is question of shedding the blood of men. Such an act is an insult against God Himself, for man is made in the image of God. In a rhythmical, juridical proverb the punishment of such a crime is laid down: 'Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed'. This is an outstanding case of the application of the *lex talionis*, which is still at work in the blood feuds of the modern Arab. Its morality is not to be judged by the conditions of our existence, but by the necessity of protecting human life when society was still in its primitive stages.

The 'P' tradition reaches its climax in the last speech of God (9:8-17). Before the flood He had promised to establish a covenant with Noah; now He fulfils His promise. The life of union with God which had been the privilege of our first parents is in some degree restored. In addition, God gives a formal, unconditional promise that He will never again send a flood to destroy men. The alliance is not merely with man, but with all the living things of the earth. As a sign or memorial of this alliance and promise, God sets the rainbow in the sky. For the ancient Hebrews it was natural to expect some visible memorial of an alliance. In the case of the pact between Jacob and Laban (Gen. 31:45-54), a pile of stones was set up. When God made His alliance with Abraham, the sign required was that of circumcision (Gen. 17:11).

It is not necessary to think that the writer supposes that the rainbow appears now for the first time. An already existing reality could be given a new meaning and so made a sign. It is instructive, however, to discuss further the symbolism which lies behind this particular sign. The Hebrew *keset* normally means a weapon of war, the bow. God is often depicted in the Old Testament as a warrior, using bow and arrows to rout His enemies.[17] The warrior's bow, then, which to His enemies is a symbol of His anger, is laid aside on the day of the alliance with

[17]Hab. 3:9, 11; Deut. 32:33, 42; Zach. 9:14; Ps. 18:15; 38:3; 144:6; Job 6:4.

Noah. For Noah God is a God of peace. God's bow, at rest in the heavens, will be a sign reminding both God and man of the eternal alliance which has been made between them. God may send the rain which always accompanies the appearance of the rainbow, but never again will He send such a flood as to wipe out the whole of mankind.

It is true that in the divination practised by the Assyrians and Babylonians we find the rainbow playing an important part. Generally it was a sign of good omen. It is not impossible that the inspired writer was influenced by this usage in selecting precisely the rainbow as the sign of God's favour, just as, for example, he selected from the same source the thunderbolt as a sign of anathema, to be set 'to guard the way to the tree of life' (Gen. 3:24).

THE 'J' TRADITION.

Let us turn now to the account of the flood as it appears in the 'J' tradition. Here we have merely fragments of the original account set into the framework of the 'P' narrative. Thus we cannot expect to find a continuous story, but must suppose much omitted by the redactor because the matter is already supplied by the corresponding elements in the 'P' tradition.

The opening section (6:5-8) is very important; here we go far beyond the common Semitic tradition. The author speaks in his own name, and puts the story in its theological setting. He does it in his own way, quite differently from the artificial manner of 'P'. Yahweh sees the universal wickedness of man; He reads the hearts of men and finds there only thoughts and desires of evil. Yahweh and sin are incompatible. This is expressed in the strongly anthropomorphic language of Yahweh's repentance and the affliction of His heart. We must understand our author. In no sense does he make of God a mere man; but he does insist that the Yahweh he worships is a *person*. He is not a force, or an abstraction, or a personified power of nature, but the *living* God. This living God cannot abide sin. But sin, except for Noah, is universal; hence the universal punishment which is threatened. Before leaving the section, we may note the hand of the redactor in the insertion of the enumeration of v. 7, which is in the style and vocabulary of 'P'.

The 'J' narrative continues in the first verses of chapter 7. It may be supposed that Yahweh, after the first vague prediction of punishment in 6:7, commanded Noah to build the ark in order to test his obedience. Noah proving perfectly

obedient, Yahweh then revealed that it was by water that He intended to blot out mankind. Noah, because he had been found 'just in the midst of this generation' was to be saved precisely by the ark he had built.

In 7:7-10, 12, 16b, 17, 22, 23, we have the 'J' account of the actual catastrophe. Even in this selection we find traces of a redactor following the style of 'P'. The enumerations of vv. 7 (the family of Noah), 8, 9, 23b, as well as the repetition in 17a, may be regarded as glosses of the redactor. In the original order v. 10 should be taken before v. 7, and 16b before 12. Thus we have the following order of events. For seven days Noah is busy preparing to enter the ark. Then he enters; God, in His paternal care, expressed with the typical intimacy of 'J', closes the door of the ark behind him. Then for forty days it continues to rain, until all living things except Noah and those with him have been destroyed.

According to the account of 'J' the flood was caused by rain; so it is the cessation of rain which marks the end of the flood (8:2b). There follows now the picturesque incident of the birds, an incident which finds no place in the other tradition, but which we have already seen depicted in the epic of Gilgamesh. In the instructions which God gave to Noah for the building of the ark, the construction of a window had been included (the word is the ordinary noun *hallôn,* not the unusual *sōhar* of 6:16). This is apparently faced upwards, so that from it Noah could see that the rain had stopped, but the view around the ark was still out of sight. Hence he used a method known also to ancient sailors to discover whether there was dry land in the vicinity. The author wishes clearly to bring to light the cleverness of the patriarch; the Hebrews had always a great respect for practical wisdom.

First of all he released a raven. The usual translation of v. 7 is: 'And he released a raven which went to and fro until the waters had dried off the earth'. The meaning, however, can be better brought out by some such paraphrase as the following: 'And he released a raven which went forth and returned again (to the ark), keeping this up until the waters had dried off the earth'. The main verb of the relative clause is in the imperfect, and is followed first by an absolute infinitive of the same verb and then by another absolute infinitive, *wāšôb.* According to Joüan (Hebrew Grammar, p. 352), in such a construction the second infinitive denotes an action simultaneous

or almost simultaneous with that of the main verb. This interpretation is in keeping with the corrected reading of the Vulgate in its new Benedictine revision: 'egrediebatur et revertebatur'.

Actually many critics doubt whether the incident of the raven belongs to the original 'J' account. In the Babylonian version a bird is sent out on three occasions only; and, in addition, the raven adds nothing to the story, merely anticipating the fuller account centering around the dove in vv. 8-12.

The story of the dove is typical of the 'J' source, with its fine economy of description and realistic touches. Noah puts out his hand for the bird on its first return. The next time it comes back with a green olive leaf, to show that the tops of the trees were beginning to appear. The Hebrew *tārāḇ*, translated often by 'green' or 'fresh', is unknown apart from this text. It is possible that it is rather a synonym for 'leaf', derived from the verb *tāraṗ*, which has the meaning 'tear', 'rend'. We certainly find a cognate form *tereṗ* used in the construct plural with the meaning of 'leaves' in Ezechiel 17:9.

It is tempting to look for the symbolism of peace in the olive leaf. This however is rather of Greek origin, and can scarcely be justified in this context. Gunkel has suggested that the leaf is a sign of good omen sent to Noah, according to the original narrative, by his protecting god. Again, there is no indication of any such meaning in the text. We are rather to take the more obvious meaning, that the trees, of which the olive is brought in merely as a common example, were beginning to appear above the waters. When the dove does not return, Noah knows that it is now safe to take up the covering of the ark. He looks around and sees that the water has disappeared.

The 'J' narrator, who supposes the distinction between clean and unclean animals already in the time of Noah, mentions explicitly that holocausts of the clean animals were offered to Yahweh. This offering does not seem to be so much a sacrifice of thanksgiving as one intended to placate the wrath of Yahweh for the future. This at least is the natural meaning one applies to the text after reading the reaction of Yahweh to the sacrifice. Despite the fact that the thoughts of man's heart are evil from his youth, God promises that He will never more send a general destruction on all living things. As in the 'P' tradition, God binds Himself to keep in restraint the powers of chaos which had been let loose in the flood, and from henceforth to preserve the order

of nature and of the seasons, so that man can live in peace and security (v. 22). God will still punish sin, but never again with a world-wide calamity. Rather He will make His sun rise upon the good and upon the wicked, and make His rain fall upon the just and the unjust (Mt. 5:45).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

So far we have seen something of the literary background of the flood narrative in its parallels of the ancient East, and we have gone on to make some examination of the text of the Bible itself. We can consider now for a moment the possibilities of actual archaeological evidence of the flood itself, the factual foundation of these accounts.

It is well known that Woolley, in his excavations at Ur, thought that he had gained clear evidence of *the* flood. As he penetrated deeper and deeper into the foundations of an ancient cemetery, he passed through the strata of various civilisations, that of Jemdet Nasr of the beginning of the third millenium, of Uruk of the second half of the fourth millenium, until he arrived at later elements of the Obeid period. This latter represents the first settlement in the region of Babylonia. Then he came upon a bed of clean clay. This appeared too high a level to be part of the original delta, so he continued digging. It was necessary to go through eight feet of clay before he came upon fragments of stone implements and painted pottery which belonged to the earlier part of the Obeid period. Here was clear evidence that a flood of considerable size had swept over the area about Ur at a point about half way through the Obeid period. Woolley took it for granted that this was the Biblical flood, and the publication of his discovery caused a considerable stir.

However, this was not the only flood to swamp a limited area in the region of Mesopotamia. There are traces of another inundation at Shuruppak; this is later than the flood of Ur, belonging to the end of the Jemdet Nasr period. Sediment one and a half feet thick, indicating still a third flood, has been discovered at Kish; this flood came shortly after the second. Which, then, of these are we to regard as the actual flood of the Bible? Possibly it is not Woolley's, but one of the last two, which has the better claim. According to the Sumerian king list, which we have already considered, it was at Shuruppak

that the last royal dynasty ruled before the flood, and it was at Kish that the first dynasty established itself, or 'was lowered from heaven', after the flood.

Perhaps it would be wiser to admit our ignorance. Given the nature of the Biblical and other ancient accounts of the flood, it seems more prudent to admit that we cannot tell what actual event was at the beginning of the tradition. This has been treated too freely and with too much creative imagination to provide the necessary data for a reply. It remains, however, of the greatest interest that evidence of actual floods in Mesopotamia has been brought to light. To use such evidence 'to prove the Bible true' is certainly a misguided apologetic; to use it as an illustration of the background of this ancient Mesopotamian tradition is highly instructive.

Actually any acquaintance with the material conditions of life in Mesopotamia renders the account of such inundations highly probable. The spring tides in the Persian Gulf can reach a height of eight or nine feet. In addition prolonged southerly gales may bank up the rivers to the extent of two or more feet. Exceptionally heavy snow in Armenia, or heavy rain further south, can send a flood of water down the Tigris and the Euphrates. In the narrow gorges to the north a landslide can hold up an immense amount of water and then release it with devastating results. The combination of any of these circumstances could bring the great rivers to such a height as to make them sweep over their banks and flood the surrounding country. Even as late as 1831 the Tigris rose with dramatic suddenness, burst its banks, and, in a single night, destroyed 7000 houses in the city of Baghdad.[18]

SCOPE AND MEANING OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT.[19]

After the preceding discussion of the literary and archaeological background of the flood narrative, it should be possible to arrive at some understanding of its scope and meaning.

---

[18]Henri Frankfort, *The Birth of Civilization in the Near East*, pp. 51-52.

[19]In this section, the writer presents an opinion which is merely a restatement of the view expounded, in their respective commentaries on Genesis, by R. de Vaux and A. Clamer, both Consultors of the Biblical Commission. Of the work of other Catholic scholars in this matter, that of G. Lambert, S.J., found in the articles already cited, is worthy of special commendation. Cf. also Junker, op. cit., pp. 25-27. The recent work of Fr. Vawter, C.M., *A Path Through Genesis*, deals excellently, in a clear, popular style, with this and all the other questions which arise in Genesis.

One thing is quite evident: there is a literary relationship between the flood of Genesis and those parallel passages quoted earlier from the literature of Mesopotamia. This is so evident as to need no proof. It does not follow that the account in the Bible derives directly or indirectly from the other texts. It is much more likely that the ancestors of the chosen people, who, according to the Bible, spring from Ur in Mesopotamia, brought with them the common store of folklore and traditions of their people, which, moulded and transformed by revealed religion, reached its written expression in the text of Genesis. The different development and scope of the narratives that of the Bible on the one hand, and that of the pagan stories on the other, this is to be explained by the different destiny of the peoples concerned. The high religious and moral teaching of the Hebrew version is due to the impact of divine revelation; but the other peoples, left to themselves, showed little appreciation of moral or divine values, and interpreted the story from the background of a gross polytheism.

However, as far as secular history is concerned, the Biblical narrative is to be set in the same class as the other narratives. In both cases we have a free and imaginative treatment of an event lost in the distant past. The details of the story are, in some instances, further removed from actual fact in the Biblical narrative than they are in the other forms of the tradition. The 'P' account presents the flood in its most extreme form when it gives the level of the water as out-topping the highest mountains. Similarly, both the Biblical and non-Biblical forms of the tradition suppose that the flood was actually universal according to the geographical ideas of those days; both suppose that all men on the face of the earth, except for the hero and those with him, were lost. Can one reasonably draw any other meaning from the text of the Bible, where we have such indications as 'I will wipe from the earth *man whom I have created* . . . for I regret that I made them.'? The making of man is, of course, that of the first chapters of Genesis. Why should God be presented as regretting the making of Adam if, let us say, a few thousand of his posterity grew wicked and merited punishment?

The writer is by no means unaware that in Hebrew idiom apparently universal expressions must sometimes be understood relatively, within the framework of the context. Even in our

daily speech we often make a general statement, only to correct it in the next sentence by giving an exception. It would be wooden in the extreme to find a difficulty in such combinations as 'every man's thought . . . was on evil' with 'Noah found favour with Yahweh' (6:5,8). But to apply this idiom so as to restrict the story of the flood to only a part of the human race is quite another matter. The context does not warrant it.

The universal terms used in the story should be taken as simply universal unless the context *clearly* modifies them; and this is done neither by the immediate nor by the greater context. The passage immediately preceding the story of the flood is obscure in the extreme. It was, at least until recent times, the more common view among Catholics (e.g., Vaccari Simon-Prado, Ceuppens, Bover) that this text referred to the posterity of both Seth and Cain. It is probably more commonly held now that it is an illustration of the wickedness of the world in general. No convincing proof has been offered to restrict it to the line of Seth. Admittedly in the wider context there is a narrowing of interest as the story of Genesis advances, Adam, Seth, Noah, Shem, Abraham, being the central figures; but to invoke this selection in order to exclude all but the Sethites from the story of the Flood is to press it too far. Noah still remains the centre of interest even though all mankind is represented as lost in the corruption of sin.

Other reasons, based on the inconveniences which arise from accepting the universality of the Flood, suppose too narrow a view of the *genus litterarium* of the early chapters of Genesis. In any case, such an approach, if it is to remove all such difficulties, can never do justice to what the Bible actually says. Either reduce the flood to an event like one of the inundations recorded in Mesopotamian archaeology, thus doing violence to the text of Genesis, or accept the text as it stands, interpreting it as a popular tradition used by the sacred writer to convey a religious and moral teaching. Surely respect for the word of God counsels the second course, and this, as a matter of fact, is the course followed by the majority of the more recent Catholic commentators to-day.

The simple reading of the text and context certainly confirms this view, which, in Jewish tradition, in New Testament times, in the acceptance of the Fathers of the Church, in the

understanding of all Christians until comparatively modern times, has been completely unanimous. The change in interpretation, restricting the scene and the persons affected by the flood to sizable limits, this came, not as a better understanding of the Oriental mind or of its literary idiom, but as a solution of the obvious physical difficulties of a really world-wide (in our sense of the 'world') disaster. The text was forced to fit a local and only comparatively universal flood, because such, it was thought, was the demand of physical science. This was not the view of the writer of the second epistle of St. Peter, a work equally inspired as the text of Genesis. He understood the flood as a catastrophe engulfing the whole earth, that disk which rests on the primeval waters of the abyss. Thus it is represented as something quite universal, as universal as creation or the general judgment: 'For of this they are wilfully ignorant, that there were heavens long ago, and an earth formed out of water and by water through the word of God. By these means the world that then was, deluged with water, perished. But the heavens that now are, and the earth, by that same word have been stored up, being reserved for fire against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men'.[20]

Modern Catholic scholars generally reject all efforts to make an artificial synthesis between scientific theory and the account of creation found in the first chapters of Genesis. They rightly leave the narrative in its true primitive setting. They look for religious teaching in the passage, not for information about the physical world.

They see divine revelation expressed in an idiom far different from the precise scientific language of to-day, whether the science be that of theology or of the material universe.

It is the first eleven chapters of Genesis which are linked together in the Letter to Cardinal Suhard. The story of the flood belongs to the same type of 'popular history' as the creation

---

[20]That the New Testament writer should take the account of the flood at its face value is not surprising; he, too, had received no revelation about the physical universe. He certainly received with equal simplicity the account of the world's creation. Even Our Lord, despite His perfect knowledge of the physical world and of historical events, did not regard it as part of His mission to enlighten us about these things. For example, one cannot argue to the historical nature of the Book of Jonas because of Our Lord's references to it in Mt. 12:39-41. Such problems are to be discussed and if possible solved in their own sphere, that of the Old Testament. The method to be adopted is that comprehensive approach outlined in *Divino Afflante Spiritu.*

narrative. It supposes the same ideas of the world. It has no difficulties about a universal deluge. To reduce the deluge to a local inundation is to follow the same logic which extended the 'days' of the creation to thousands of years. Both are apologetic solutions based on a misunderstanding of the *genus litterarium* of the text. As far back as 1903, Lagrange, the light of the modern Catholic revival of Biblical studies, could write of the early chapters of Genesis: 'It was quite out of the question to write real history, and yet it was of importance to show by a continuous chain of evidence the unity of the history of salvation. The Bible avoids absurd or obscene accounts; there is no pretence of ignoring sin, but sin receives its due punishment and is not glorified, as though it changed its character by becoming the privilege of heroes. The Bible avoids even unfounded stories. It is taken up with tangible things, with discoveries which are still known; it relates their origin and progress, and leaves them in a hazy light, which has no outward semblance of actual history . . . I find a similar regard for reality, in so far as it can be reached and set forth, in the story of the deluge and the tower of Babel'.[21]

Thus the Bible gives us no accurate account of the extent of the flood, the number of those who perished, or the circumstantial details of the event. The inspired writer was content, in what we may call the secular details of the story, merely to hand on the perennial tradition of his people. The conscientious way in which he passed this tradition on is to be seen, above all, in the two accounts of the story which he preserves. Though their details do not agree, he does not force a harmony on them. He has no better sources at hand, so he faithfully records what has been handed down.

INERRANCY.

But how, the reader may ask, can such an interpretation of the text fit in with the teaching of the Church on Biblical inerrancy? One very important principle should be made clear at the very beginning: there can be no question of discussing truth or error in any particular passage until we first come to correct conclusions about its *genus litterarium*, that is, about the scope and purpose of its author. By reading between the lines in the Bible, we may be able to come to interesting conclusions

[21] *Historical Criticism of the Old Testament*, trans. Myers, pp. 206-207.

about the opinions and views of the sacred writer on questions of science and history. But such conclusions are not necessarily to be included in *the meaning the writer wished to convey;* in fact, in the case of the early chapters of Genesis, we have ample evidence that the sacred writer had no interest in such questions. The meaning he wished to convey was exclusively a moral and religious one. It should be absolutely clear, then, that his views on science and secular history are irrelevant when we come to the discussion of Biblical inerrancy. No doubt the redactor of the creation narratives in Genesis really accepted the ideas of the physical world prevalent in his day; but such ideas did not come formally into the meaning he wished to convey: his scope was not physical science, but religion.

Similarly, in the passage we are studying, the writer's scope is essentially a religious one. He takes the ancient tradition, handed down from the distant past, a tradition which in its material elements is much the same as that which the pagan peoples preserve, and he interprets this in the light of divine revelation about God and His attributes; he makes of it an instrument of religious teaching about God and His dealing with men. This is the formal element, which transmutes the rough matter of popular tradition into a simple but sublime lesson on the holiness, the mercy, the universal providence of God, the sinfulness of mankind, the punishment of sin, the reward of the just.

With the precision and clarity which distinguish his commentary Pere de Vaux sums up these ideas in an introductory note: 'The Bible does not depend on any of the Babylonian accounts, but draws on the same heritage as they: the memory of one or several disastrous inundations in the valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates which tradition had magnified into a universal cataclysm. Only, and this is the essential point, the sacred writer has charged this memory with an eternal teaching on the justice and mercy of God, on the malice of man and the salvation which is granted to the just'.[22]

This teaching is indeed eternal, since it belongs to the inspired word of God which illuminated the faithful of the Old Testament and instructs the heirs of the New. The story of Noah has received constant commentary in the other inspired books,

---

[22]De Vaux, op. cit., p. 57.

and his salvation has become the type of the one central and essential salvation, which is to eternal life.

ECHOES IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

In an outstanding passage, the great anonymous prophet of the exile recalls the promise God made to Noah. Here we have not merely a parallel to the alliance made with Noah; we have its fulfilment in the New Sion, the New Alliance. And we have the right to re-read and interpret the story of Noah in the light of this magnificent vision:

> For a brief moment did I forsake thee,
> And with great love will I gather thee;
> In a flood of wrath did I hide my face
> From thee for a moment,
> But with eternal mercy I take compassion on thee,
> Said thy redeemer Yahweh.
> For this is to Me as in the days of Noah,
> When I swore that the waters of Noah
> Should never more pass over the earth;
> So do I swear not to be wroth with thee,
> Nor to rebuke thee;
> Though the mountains should move,
> And the hills be shaken,
> Yet My mercy shall not depart from thee,
> Nor My covenant of peace be shaken,
> Said Yahweh who has mercy on thee.[23]

In the honour-roll of God's faithful servants Noah has his place,[24] and it was he, the innocent one, that Wisdom steered to safety by the simple expedient of a raft, so giving the world a second term of life.[25]

Among the cloud of witnesses who watch from above the strivings of their brethren in faith, Noah, the hero of faith, stands; it was he 'who proved the whole world wrong, and was left heir to the justification which comes through faith'.[26] The destruction of Jerusalem, itself the forerunner of the final judgment of the world, is linked by Our Lord with the catastrophe of the flood.[27] But it is above all as the type of Christian Baptism that the Church has exploited the event of the flood. In this it follows the example of the first Epistle of St. Peter: 'In that ark a few, that is eight souls, were saved through water. Its counterpart, Baptism, now saves you also (not a fleshly

---

[23]Isaias 54:7-10, translated by Kissane.
[24]Ecclus. 44:17; Ez. 14:14.
[25]Wis. 10:4.
[26]Heb. 11:8, Knox.
[27]Mt. 24:37-41.

putting away of dirt, but the pledge to God proceeding from a good conscience), through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.'[28] Noah and his family are types of those 'born again of water and the Holy Ghost' in the times of fulfilment. Noah was saved 'through water'; water too was used in ritual cleasing by the Jews; but the waters of Baptism now give inward purification, eternal salvation. The ark which gave shelter to 'eight souls' foreshadows the Church of God, a refuge not limited to a few, but open wide to all of good will. And all these new wonders flow from a new act of God, that act of truly divine power by which He raised His Son, Jesus Christ, to life, making Him the first-born from the dead, the first-born among many brethren.

W. J. DALTON, S.J.,
Canisius College, Pymble, N.S.W.

[28] I. Pet. 3:20-21.

Moral Theology

ATTENDANCE AT AFTERNOON MASS

Dear Rev. Sir,

In a large City, which comprises several parishes, there is an afternoon Mass each Sunday in one of the churches. What is the obligation of people from other parts of the City to be present at this Mass, if they have not been to Mass in the morning?

Quaerens.

REPLY

Those who have not been to Mass on Sunday morning are bound to attend a Mass celebrated later in the day, even in a church outside their parish, unless they are excused for some serious reason.

The faithful are to hear Mass on Sundays and other Feasts of precept.[1] It is left to their own choice to be present at any Mass celebrated at an hour permitted by Law or Indult between midnight and midnight. Because the priest is forbidden to commence Mass earlier than an hour before dawn and later than one hour after mid-day, unless he has the required permission, the period within which Mass may be heard will frequently be limited to what may be called the morning.[2] Again, the number of Masses will depend on how many priests are available in the locality. The general law is that a priest may celebrate only once a day (except on Christmas and All Souls' Day).[3] With the permission of the Bishop, to be granted when the good of a notable part of the people demands it, Mass may be celebrated later than the hour set down in the Code.[4] An afternoon or evening Mass on Sunday provides an opportunity of fulfilling the Church's precept in the same manner as does the second Mass offered by the one priest, who may be authorised by the Ordinary to binate to enable a sufficient number of people to attend Mass on the days prescribed. Of recent years, the Holy See has frequently granted indults for the same priest to celebrate three Masses for the convenience of the people on Sundays and Holidays. The fact that the Mass is outside the normal hours, or is the second (or

---

[1]can. 1248.
[2]can. 821, par. 1.
[3]can. 806, par. 1.
[4]Motu proprio *Sacram Communionem*. A.A.S. 1957, p. 178.

even third) Mass of the same priest, does not affect the question at issue. Whether the people have the opportunity of choosing between several Masses or whether they are not so favoured, they are bound to hear one Mass some time on every Sunday or Holiday. If they cannot or do not wish to attend Mass in the morning, they are bound *sub gravi* to take advantage of Mass celebrated during the afternoon. The precept still urges, the means to fulfil it are at hand, and the principle applies: *Qui tenetur ad finem tenetur ad media.*

There is no law restricting the place where the Sunday obligation is to be fulfilled to one's own parish church; nor is a person excused from attending Mass for the sole reason that he is unable to go to the nearest church. For practical purposes, the law of hearing Mass may be satisfied wherever the Holy Sacrifice is offered, except in a strictly private oratory. There is no escaping the conclusion that those who live in other parishes of a large City and have not heard Mass in the morning are bound to attend an evening Mass which is celebrated in another church, unless they are excused because of physical or moral impossibility.

Physical impossibility would prevent the infirm who cannot leave the house, or at least are unable to travel any distance at all etc., as well as all who live so far from the church that the journey is simply out of the question. If all the good will of a devoted Catholic soul cannot arrange the means to hear Mass, one may be satisfied that the obstacle was physically insurmountable. This cause will be easily recognisable, but moral impossibility is not so readily determined. Moral impossibility arises from grave inconvenience, which is such that, when everything is considered, a person would not be reasonably expected to hear Mass on a certain Sunday, although absolutely speaking he could do so. When the question of what is 'reasonably to be expected' is discussed, we must bear in mind that the precept of hearing Mass is a grave one, though not as grave as many other ecclesiastical laws. From some of her laws, v.g. the diriment impediment of the Sacred Order of Priesthood, the Church will not dispense at all; from others, the Holy See readily grants a dispensation, if there be a canonical cause, as happens with some other of the matrimonial impediments; in other cases, the Bishop may dispense, as from the interstices between the

various Orders;[5] while not only the Ordinary but even the Parish Priest may grant a dispensation from the law of sanctifying Sunday, in particular cases for individuals or families.[6] The reluctance of the Church to dispense from a law is a good indication of the seriousness with which she regards it. While we have no desire to minimise the importance of Sunday Mass in the life of a Catholic, one must not proceed to the other extreme and make it a means necessary *necessitate medii ad salutem.* A rather serious reason is required for a Catholic to act reasonably by omitting Mass, but an extraordinary reason which borders on physical impossibility is not called for.

Necessity, charity and duty are the usual causes given as the basis of moral impossibility. "Necessity" includes the prudent care of our health, outside the case of serious illness, considerable distance from the church, the fear children of careless parents may entertain of displeasing parents who will not allow them to go to Mass, etc. Under the heading of "charity" would come the care of infants or the sick who cannot be left unattended, and analogous cases; while "duty" excuses those whose occupation in life demands that they work on Sundays at such hours that they cannot go to Mass.

A perennial subject of discussion is: How far is a person bound to travel to hear Mass? Since the older theologians laid down the rules, circumstances have changed. No longer do we think of a journey of any length on foot or by carriage. Walking and travel by horse-drawn vehicle have passed into disuse with the advent of mechanical modes of conveyance. The standard of an hour's journey by foot over ordinary roads, in fair weather, and for a person in normal health, is out-moded as a means of judging a reason which will excuse from hearing Mass. It is difficult to transfer such a norm to meet the common means of travel in vogue to-day. An hour's journey by car or by public transport is less fatiguing than a walk of the same time: but it implies other inconveniences, not the least of which is expense. Expense is largely a relative matter and the inconvenience it causes may be serious enough for those who struggle to make ends meet, while for people blessed with an abundance of this world's goods it may be a very minor consideration. It is impossible to determine absolutely what length of time a person

[5]can. 978, par. 2.
[6]can. 1245, par. 1.

is bound to travel or how much he should be prepared to spend to be present at Mass. A journey which would be undertaken without thought of the trouble involved in order to attend to the affairs of every-day life would seem to be a reasonable demand when it is a question of travelling to Sunday Mass. This does not mean that Caius, who lives twenty miles from his work and travels to and fro every day, because he can find no accommodation nearer his place of business, would be bound to make the journey again on Sunday for Mass. But if Caius makes this long journey to work of his own free choice and does not think it extraordinary for a person of his means and state in life, it is hard to see why he would not be bound to travel the same distance on Sunday for Mass, if he could not fulfil his obligation any other way. Or if he does not find it a burden to travel to the City every Saturday (not just once in a while) for some entertainment, can he reasonably plead it is too much to put himself to the same trouble to sanctify the Lord's Day according to the manner prescribed by the Church?

We may conclude that a person who has not been to Mass on Sunday morning is bound to go in the afternoon, in any church which is within reasonable distance, provided he is not otherwise excused.

NOTE ON AFTERNOON MASSES.

The faculty of permitting Mass in the evening was granted by Pope Pius XII. to all the Ordinaries of the Latin Church by the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* (6th Jan., 1953).[7] This faculty was subsequently extended by a Motu Proprio of His Holiness *Sacram Communionem* (19th March, 1957).[8] The purpose of the Motu Proprio was not to modify what was previously granted, but to make the concessions even wider. Though there is one slight restriction in that the term *Ordinarius* does not include the Vicar General, unless he has a special mandate from the Bishop, a glance at the two documents will show a very appreciable extension of the facilities now enjoyed by the Diocesan Ordinary, for the benefit of the people under his pastoral care.

The Constitution *Christus Dominus* empowered the Ordinary to permit Mass in the evening on feasts of pre-

The Motu Proprio *Sacram Communionem* enables the

[7] A.A.S. 1953, p. 22.
[8] A.A.S. 1957, p. 177.

cept, either now in force or suppressed; on the first Friday of each month; on the occasion of solemnities celebrated with a gathering of people, and also on one other day of the week. The reason: *Si rerum adiuncta id necessario postulant.*

local Ordinary to allow Mass after noon every day.

The reason: *Si bonum spirituale notabalis partis christifidelium id postulat.*

The Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* sanctioned Evening Masses (vespertinis horis), which were not to begin before four o'clock; while the Motu Proprio used the term: *horis postmeridianis,* which seemed to be without any restriction as to the hour after noon when the Mass could commence. A private reply of the S. Congregation of Rites, given to the Cardinal Archbishop of Genoa, 21st June, 1957, and published in the Ephemerides Liturgicae (1957, p. 316) declares that the norm of the Constitution *Christus Dominus* forbidding the Mass after noon earlier than four o'clock is still in force. This would seem to negative what was written in the A.C.R. (1957, p. 142).

We must bear in mind that the latest concessions are not a dispensation from the law of the Code. We have now a new law which holds, *contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus, etiam speciali mentione dignis,* and it is to be interpreted as it stands. The faculty to celebrate Mass after noon bears a certain similarity to the faculty for bination, as it requires the intervention of the Ordinary; but it is wider in its application, being available from the Ordinary, if needs be, every day, and not merely for the feasts on which we are bound to hear Mass. It may be granted whenever the spiritual good of a notable part of the faithful requires it. The number of persons whose spiritual good is catered for should be according to the same rules as for bination—about twenty.

Some time will probably elapse before both clergy and laity become accustomed to the new order of things. Mass may not be said after one o'clock, p.m., without the permission of the Ordinary; and he cannot grant it except for the spiritual good of a notable number of people. Given this need, permission for an afternoon Mass would seem to be no more extraordinary than the faculty for bination, as both are concessions according to the law.

JAMES MADDEN St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Canon Law

NON-CATHOLICS AND MATRIMONIAL IMPEDIMENTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I would be grateful for some discussion in the pages of the A.C.R. of the following questions which concern the efficacy of canonical matrimonial impediments in relation to non-Catholics:

1. Canon 12 of the Code of Canon Law states that only baptized persons are subject to ecclesiastical laws. Does this mean that even baptized non-Catholics are subject to the canonical matrimonial impediments?

2. What is the position of unbaptized persons? Does Canon 12 imply that they are simply not bound by the canonical impediments to marriage?

3. If non-Catholics are bound by these impediments, could their understandable ignorance of these save their marriages from canonical invalidity if contracted with a diriment impediment?

INTERESTED.

REPLY.

Before attempting to answer each of the three questions proposed by our correspondent, it will be useful and even necessary to prepare the way by directing attention to two points: (a) This first point is already suggested in the queries as proposed by our correspondent; but it will be well to make it as explicit as possible. It is that the terms *non-baptized* and *non-Catholic* are not identical and co-extensive, since even a non-Catholic may be validly baptized. It follows, therefore, that in considering the efficacy of the canonical matrimonial impediments in relation to non-Catholics, one has to consider them, not in relation to one class of persons, namely non-Catholics simply, but rather in relation to two different classes of persons, namely non-Catholics who are validly baptized and non-Catholics who are not baptized: (b) The second point to which attention is directed is that a distinction must be drawn between canonical matrimonial impediments which are of ecclesiastical law only and those which are of divine law as well as of

ecclesiastical law. With these distinctions in mind we can now consider the three proposed questions.

THE FIRST QUESTION.

The first question of our correspondent is restricted to those non-Catholics who are validly baptized; and he desires to know whether these validly baptized non-Catholics are subject to the matrimonial impediments contained in the Church's canonical legislation.

The general principle in this matter is that validly baptized non-Catholics are bound by the canonical impediments to marriage, both impedient and diriment. It is true that no canon in the Code of Canon Law expressly asserts this principle as we have stated it. However, there is scarcely any necessity for an express ruling to this effect, since it is the only conclusion that can be drawn from certain other canons that are contained in the Code.

Thus, when Canon 12—referred to by our correspondent—states that "those who have not received baptism are not bound by merely ecclesiastical laws," it surely follows as a necessary conclusion that those who have received baptism are bound by those laws, and also that there is no exception among baptized people since there is no additional restriction of the ruling to embrace only baptized Catholics. The general ruling of this canon in relation to ecclesiastical laws is particularized by the legislator and applied to matrimonial impediments in Canon 1038, § 2, which states: "To the same Supreme (Ecclesiastical) Authority belongs exclusively the right to establish other impeding or invalidating matrimonial impediments *for baptized persons,* either by way of universal or particular law." This canon, in referring to *baptized* persons, includes even non-Catholics who are validly baptized since no distinction is made, and where there is no distinction there is no exception. And all this reasoning is in perfect accord with the contents of Canon 87: "By baptism a human being is constituted a person in the Church of Christ with all the rights and obligations of Christians, unless, as far as rights are concerned, there is some obstacle impeding the bond of communion with the Church, or a censure inflicted by the Church." The same doctrine is contained in Canon 1960 which affirms that "the matrimonial causes *of baptized persons* (inter baptizatos) belong by proper and exclusive right to the ecclesiastical judge;" and Article I

of the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, issued on August 15, 1936, quotes this canon and clarifies any possible ambiguity arising from the phrase *inter baptizatos* by adding: "The same holds even if only one party is baptized." And, finally, Canon 1016 can find a place in this matter: "The marriage of *baptized persons* is regulated, not only by divine law, *but also by Canon Law,* the civil power remaining competent in regard to the merely civil effects of marriage."

This doctrine is also confirmed by the Code in an indirect way, namely in so far as baptized non-Catholics are expressly exempted from certain rulings. Thus, for example, Canon 1099, § 2 expressly exempts baptized non-Catholics from the observance of the canonical form of marriage whenever they contract marriage with non-Catholics; while Canon 1070, § 1 excludes baptized non-Catholics from the diriment impediment of Disparity of Cult, unless they are converted to the Catholic Church. The conclusion to be drawn from such exemptions is that these baptized non-Catholics are bound by the remaining laws which do not positively exempt them. For, if the Church rules that *baptized persons* are subject to her laws, it follows that all without exception are so bound unless she does in fact exempt them; and where there is no exemption, therefore, there must remain the obligation.

Consequently, our answer to the first query of our correspondent may be summarized as follows: (1) As far as matrimonial impediments of merely ecclesiastical law are concerned, baptized non-Catholics are subject to them unless, by way of exception, they are exempted. (2) As far as matrimonial impediments of divine law as well as ecclesiastical law are concerned, baptized non-Catholics are bound by them since those impediments of their very nature embrace all people, just as the divine law itself extends to all.

THE SECOND QUESTION.

The second query of our correspondent is concerned with unbaptized non-Catholics; and he desires to know whether the import of Canon 12 is that non-baptized persons are simply not bound by the canonical matrimonial impediments. In the first place, a distinction is recalled that was set down at the very beginning of this reply; and it is the distinction between matrimonial impediments that are of ecclesiastical law only and those matrimonial impediments that are of divine law as well as of ecclesiastical law.

In regard to non-baptized persons and canonical impediments which are of divine law the ruling of Canon 1038, § 1 finds an application: "It belongs to the Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority alone to declare authentically when the divine law impedes or invalidates marriage." Since all persons, baptized and unbaptized, are subject to the divine law, and since it is the exclusive province of the Church to declare what matrimonial impediments are of divine law, it follows that even non-baptized persons are subject to those canonical matrimonial impediments which, although affirmed by ecclesiastical law, are in reality impediments of divine law; for example, the impediment of Ligamen. And they are bound by such impediments, not simply because these impediments are the subject of ecclesiastical laws since, in accordance with Canons 12 and 87, the unbaptized are not subject to merely ecclesiastical laws, but because these impediments are of divine law to which all are subject independently of baptism. The ecclesiastical law is simply an authentic declaration of the divine law in the matter, so that they are really and fundamentally bound by virtue of the divine law.

As far as matrimonial impediments of merely ecclesiastical law are concerned, it should be clear from what has already been said that unbaptized persons are not bound by them. This is clear from Canons 12 and 87; and, moreover, in Canon 1038, § 2—already quoted above—the Church vindicates to itself the right to establish matrimonial impediments only for baptized persons. This is an implicit assertion that the impediments of merely ecclesiastical law do not extend to the unbaptized. In practice, too, this is recognized by the Church which acknowledges the power of the civil authority to establish even diriment impediments for unbaptized persons.

Before proceeding to answer our correspondent's third question, we think that it will not be out of place here to elaborate to some extent a couple of points which are suggested by the remarks of the preceding paragraph. The principle set down in the preceding paragraph, namely, that non-baptized persons are not bound by impediments of purely ecclesiastical law, is sufficiently clear in its application to the marriages of non-baptized persons when they contract marriage among themselves. But what is the position when an unbaptized person contracts marriage with a baptized person who is bound by a diriment ecclesiastical impediment? And this question itself

suggests another question which, although strictly not embraced by the query of our correspondent, can be referred to here: What is the position when an unbaptized person who is bound by a diriment impediment of civil law (to which he is subject) contracts marriage with a baptized person who is free to marry?

In regard to the case envisaged in the first of these two questions, namely, when the unbaptized person is not labouring under any diriment impediment of civil law and the baptized person is under a diriment impediment of ecclesiastical law, all admit that such a marriage would be invalid in Canon Law because a valid marriage supposes the complete competency (habilitas) of both parties; it cannot be valid for one party and invalid for the other. This, too, is in accordance with the ruling of Canon 1036, § 3, which states: "Although the impediment exists on the part of only one of the parties, it nevertheless renders the marriage either unlawful or invalid."

However, in regard to the case envisaged in the second of the two questions, namely, when the baptized person does not labour under any diriment impediment of ecclesiastical law but the unbaptized person is under a diriment impediment of civil law (which is not opposed to the divine law), there is disagreement among the canonists as to whether such a marriage would be valid or not. Those canonists who maintain that such a marriage would be invalid argue that for the validity of a marriage it is necessary that both parties should be completely competent (habiles) in their own right to contract marriage, and that this principle is expressly set down in Canon 1036, § 3—already quoted above. This would not be verified in the hypothesis, and, since the Church has no jurisdiction over the unbaptized, she cannot render the unbaptized party competent for the marriage by a dispensation; for the granting of a dispensation is an act of jurisdiction. Moreover, it is argued that even if it were to be granted that the Church has some competency over the matrimonial contract as such, it would not make any difference in the case, since matrimonial impediments affect the person, not the contract, and the Church has no jurisdiction over the unbaptized person. Hence, these canonists conclude that such a marriage could become valid only if a dispensation were to be granted by the competent authority in the case, which for unbaptized persons is the civil authority.

However, other canonists maintain that such a marriage would be valid even without a dispensation from the civil

authority. In effect, they maintain that the civil impediment simply ceases. Their argument is that where there is such a conflict of rights between ecclesiastical law and civil law, the ecclesiastical law—as the law of the superior society—must prevail. Moreover, it is also suggested that since—as was pointed out in the reply to our correspondent's first question—the matrimonial cases of baptized persons, even if only one party is baptized, belong exclusively to the province of the Church, and since the exclusive right of judging supposes the exclusive right of making laws (*ius fori sequitur ius condendi leges*), it follows that in these marriages where one person is not baptized civil impediments have no effect. These canonists maintain, therefore, that in such marriages one must attend only to the laws of the Church.

In regard to this problem, however, we think that a further step towards its clarification may be found in an application of the distinction between absolute and relative impediments. An impediment is absolute if it affects a person regardless of or independently of any other person; for example, the impediment of age. An impediment is relative when it affects a person only in relation to another person; that is, it cannot affect one person without at the same time affecting another person; for example, the impediment of consanguinity. Applying this distinction to a marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person, would it not be reasonable to maintain that if a *relative* diriment impediment of civil law existed the marriage should be regarded simply as valid; and the reason would be founded in the indivisibility of marriage and the fact that otherwise it would have to be conceded that the civil authority was exercising power over the competency of a baptized person since, in our hypothesis of a relative impediment, the baptized person would be equally affected. This, of course, would contradict the principle already set down and admitted by canonists generally, that a baptized person is not subject to the civil authority in this matter. On the other hand, would it not likewise be reasonable to maintain that if, in the case of a marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person, the unbaptized party was bound by an *absolute* impediment of civil law, the marriage should be regarded simply as invalid. This appears to be the legitimate conclusion from the fact that the civil authority may establish diriment impediments for unbaptized persons and from the principle contained in Canon 1036, § 3, namely, that even when

a diriment impediment exists only on the part of one of the parties it makes the marriage invalid. Moreover, since the present hypothesis is concerned with an absolute impediment which binds the unbaptized party independently of the baptized party, it could not be urged that the civil authority is exercising power over the competency of a baptized person.

THE THIRD QUESTION.

With regard to the third question of our correspondent it appears to be a reasonable assumption that, in submitting this question, he has in mind ignorance of impediments of merely ecclesiastical law on the part of non-Catholics who would be bound by them. After all, there can be no question that ignorance of matrimonial impediments which are of divine law, whether it be ignorance on the part of baptized or unbaptized persons, does not prevent the objective invalidity of the marriage; for example, a marriage contracted in ignorance of the impediment of Ligamen is invalid, or, in other words, ignorance cannot render valid a marriage which is contracted with a person already bound by a valid marriage. Therefore, since this is so and since unbaptized persons are not bound by merely ecclesiastical impediments, it follows that the question proposed by our correspondent may be expressed in this way: Can ignorance in baptized non-Catholics of merely ecclesiastical diriment impediments save their marriages from objective invalidity when such impediments do in fact exist?

The answer to this question must be in the negative. The ecclesiastical laws which state the diriment impediments are invalidating laws, and Canon 16, § 1 of the Code states that ignorance of invalidating laws does not excuse from them, unless it is otherwise expressly stated. Even inculpable ignorance does not excuse. Consequently, it follows that even baptized non-Catholics who may be ignorant of ecclesiastical matrimonial impediments, even though they may be in good faith, are not excused from the observance of them. Hence, their ignorance of the diriment ecclesiastical impediments, when these exist in their cases, does not prevent the canonical and objective invalidity of the marriages. However, it will not be out of place to repeat here that the diriment impediment of Disparity of Cult is an exception in the sense that the legislator—in Canon 1070, 1—makes it clear that in any case baptized non-Catholics are exempted from this impediment. But it is not ignorance that

will exempt them from this impediment and leave their marriage valid (on this score), but the positive exemption granted by the legislator whether they are ignorant of it or not.

G. C. GALLEN

(St. Patrick's College, Manly.)

SHORT NOTICE

1. THE GIFT OF ONESELF, by Joseph Schryvers, C.SS.R.

2. THINK AND PRAY, by Father Joseph McSorley.
Uniform edition: 238 pp., Longmans, 1957. 9/6 sterling.

3. THEY SPEAK BY SILENCES, by a Carthusian (uniform with 1 and 2). 135 pp. 7/6 sterling.

These neat white volumes, protected by their brown and cream jackets, should be a welcome addition to any spiritual library.

1. Father Schryvers is becoming well-known to English Religious through the translation of several of his works. The one under review was first published in English in 1934. Readers acquainted with the 17th-century spiritual classic, *Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence*, by Caussade, will realise that Father Schryvers has steeped himself in that book which has helped to form so many saints. Many people who find it hard to read Caussade will be grateful to Father Schryvers for his simple exposition of a truth that we all must learn: the importance of our trustful acceptance of the present moment. "How sad," writes the author, "to see so many good souls who are called to intimate life with Jesus, and who are yet absorbed in a thousand useless things, preoccupied, sad, bored, disquieted, because they will not limit their life to the single present moment which God is granting them."

2. In the book, *Think And Pray*, Father McSorley, of the Paulist Fathers in U.S.A., has gathered together prayers which he prepared for use during small public retreats—missions, we would probably call them. The prayers were read aloud each night from the rear of the chapel immediately after the Blessed Sacrament had been exposed for Benediction; the reading was punctuated with many brief and several long pauses. The prayers were first published in book form in 1936; in this second printing the original title—very apt—has been retained. The arrangement in short lines makes it an attractive meditation book for anyone looking for such help, or for any priest conducting retreats for lay-folk.

3. It is always a good moment for some of us when such elect souls as the Carthusians become articulate to the extent of having their thoughts published and scattered abroad. A snippet from a review of this book in the staid *British Weekly* announces: "Pure Gold." It is indeed an unusually beautiful little book. The author, anonymous, died in 1945, having held for many years various positions of authority in the Carthusian Order. Wise and consoling thoughts rise up to greet us from every page: "Do not seek too eagerly to feel God's assistance. Feeling is like the fragrance of our eternal homeland, perceived through the veil of faith."

—M.O.

Liturgy

SOME NOTES ON HOLY WEEK

The following short notes on a number of aspects of the rites of Holy Week may help to clarify the aspects which are touched upon.

A FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH

The importance we attach to the annual celebration of the mysteries of our Redemption will depend in large measure upon our appreciation of the fundamental truth enunciated by the Decree *Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria* which introduced the Restored Order of Holy Week. 'The liturgical rites of Holy Week, being of singular dignity and endowed with peculiar sacramental power and efficacy to nourish Christian life, cannot be adequately compensated for by those pious exercises of devotion which are called extra-liturgical. . . .' It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that too often the rites of this week were looked upon as some form of external solemnity, the delight of rubricists but a nightmare for the parochial clergy. The Mass of the Pre-sanctified, for example, was not nearly as popular as the Stations and Sermon in the afternoon, while the Holy Saturday rites were completed before breakfast and the way was cleared for the regular routine of the Saturday Confessions and Weddings. Undoubtedly there were extenuating circumstances, and the liturgy itself had become burdened by a number of accidental elements, all of which tended to obscure the central themes. The process of re-orientation may be difficult and slow, but it will be wholly unsuccessful unless we accept with conviction the clear teaching of the Church that these sacred rites of the liturgy have a singular dignity and are endowed with a peculiar sacramental power and efficacy to nourish Christian life. No form of popular devotion, however commendable in itself, can praise God and sanctify men as effectively as the rites of the Sacred Liturgy, the public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, Head and members. The Liturgy draws its efficacy not merely from the interior dispositions of those who participate in the sacred rites, for through it Christ is constantly exercising his priestly office. On this fundamental understanding of the efficacy of the liturgical rites we must base our preaching and action.

THE PARTICIPATION OF THE FAITHFUL

A second truth, which derives immediately from what has been said and which must be equally appreciated by every priest, is the participation of the faithful in the sacred rites. The Congregation of Rites has defined it in this way: 'The purpose of the Restored Order of Holy Week being that the venerable liturgy of those days may be more easily, devoutly and fruitfully attended by the faithful when it is restored to its proper and more opportune hours, it is of the greatest importance that every care should be taken to achieve this object' (*Instruction*). By virtue of their Baptism the faithful have the right to participate in the public worship of the Mystical Body of Christ. Since the Church has been established as a hierarchical society not all its members enjoy equal powers, but by the same token the ruled no less than the rulers make up the whole society and each group has its own proper contribution to make to the one public act of worship—it is 'the joint-work of members of the same organism, which acts as a single living entity.' The Pope explained the nature of this joint action in his address after the Assisi Congress (1956). 'If the Hierarchy communicates by means of the liturgy the truth and the grace of Christ, the faithful, on their side, have for their task the reception of them, giving to them their wholehearted consent, the transforming of them into living elements of value. All that is offered to them—the graces of the Sacrifice of the Altar, the sacraments and sacramentals—they accept not in a passive manner, allowing them simply to flow over them, but offering the collaboration of all their will and strength, and above all, participating in the liturgical offices or at least following their performance with fervour. . . . The contribution which is brought to the liturgy by the Hierarchy and by the faithful is not reckoned as two separate quantities, but represents the joint-work of the members of the same organism, which acts as a single living entity. The shepherds and the flock, the teaching Church and the Church taught, form a single individual Body of Christ.'

A feature of the Restored Order is the way in which the rubrics explicitly provide for the part of the faithful, in other words, the 'red print' no longer confines its directions to the priest-celebrant and his assistants, but takes account of the other party to this joint-work, the faithful. 'Omnes respondent' is a directive which should be implemented wherever it occurs, and not simply during the replies in the renewal of the Baptismal

Promises. The faithful have their determined place in the processions of Palm Sunday and at the Easter Vigil, while the branches, the New Fire and the Baptismal Water must be blessed in full view of the people.

To pretend that the reducing of these rubrics to practice is devoid of difficulty would be unrealistic, at the same time it is equally unrealistic to forget that a normal routine of Low Masses tends to obscure our clear perception of the community character of the public worship of the people of God. We should encourage the faithful to voice their approval of the solemn petitions which the priest makes to God in the name of all.

THE RITES WITH OR WITHOUT CHANT

The publication of the *Ritus Simplex* (February, 1957) made provision for the celebration of the rites of Holy Week without chant, as had previously been done by the *Memoriale Rituum.* Is it a matter of indifference, then, whether the rites be sung?

A first principle may be expressed in the words of the *Instruction* of the Congregation of Rites: 'Where a sufficient number of sacred ministers is available, the sacred functions of Holy Week should be carried out with the full splendour of of the sacred rites' (n. 4). The ideal is thus clearly stated and requires no comment. Secondly, 'where, however, there are not sufficient sacred ministers, the simple rite should be used, observing the particular rubrics as noted in their respective place' (ibid.). The simple rite is, therefore, imposed by force of circumstances. By the same reasoning, we may conclude that the use of the simple rite without chant is only a third choice imposed by necessity. It is quite erroneous to argue that since the Church allows the rites without chant she manifests no preference for one or other form. What the Church wishes is that as many as possible of the faithful should participate in the rites and she accordingly provides for their celebration in extreme cases with a minimum of solemnity.

The present Holy Father, in his Encyclical on Sacred Music, has said: 'Music's relation to worship is almost that of a server to a priest. This is the rightful worth of sacred music, this its lofty purpose. The beauty and magnificence of its melodies set off and enhance the words of the priest's offering and of the people's praise of God. It has of its nature the ability to lift the thought of the faithful up to God and makes the liturgical prayers of the Christian community more living and more

fervent. It thus enables everyone to offer his praises and petitions to God, One and Three, with a much greater earnestness and efficacy. Thanks then to sacred music, the honour that the Church in union with Christ, its Head, gives to God, is increased. There is also an increase in the fruits that the faithful, through the inspiration of music, gather from the liturgy and then show forth in a life and conduct worthy of a Christian.' To these words might be added those of Pope Pius XI.: 'It is truly necessary that the faithful should not assist at the sacred rites as merely detached and silent onlookers, but should be filled with a sense of the beauty of the liturgy and sing alternately with the priest or the *schola cantorum* as the rubrics prescribe.'

The desirability of having the sung form of the rites is evident. Priests should not be over-exacting in their own regard if the Lord has not endowed them with a particularly fine voice, since their occasional sharp or flat tone will be more than compensated for by the opportunity given the faithful 'to offer their praises and petitions to God with a much greater earnestness and efficacy' and the prayer of the people of God gathered to celebrate the mysteries of their Redemption will be more living and more fervent. On the other hand, even though the choir may not be capable of mastering the Gregorian melodies of certain parts of the Proper, all should be able to sing them in psalm tones.

A further indication of the Church's desire to have a more solemn form of the rites may be found in the use of the Assistant Deacon in the simple rite, i.e., without a sub-deacon.

ASSISTANT DEACON IN SIMPLE RITE

The *Ordinances and Declarations* of the Congregation of Rites (February, 1957) stated that where the functions of Holy Week are celebrated according to the simple rite, and when another priest or deacon is available, it is quite permissible for him, vested as a deacon, to perform the duties of a deacon in a High Mass.

The *Missa cantata* with an assistant deacon is a very ancient usage that has been maintained in some monastic congregations. Contrary to the impression that one might form, the *Missa cantata* is not an adapted form of the High Mass, it has its own distinct origin. The High Mass has been derived from the Pontifical Mass. In the ancient Church, there was alongside the Pontifical function the presbyteral Mass celebrated by a priest

assisted by a second cleric, generally a deacon. This form of the Mass was the forerunner of what we now know as the *Missa cantata,* and would have been used frequently in the smaller churches of the cities and in the country areas. It was also a regular feature of monastic liturgies when monks were generally not ordained. In the course of time, however, it was influenced by borrowings from the High Mass and gradually gave way to this latter form of the sung Mass as the number of sacred ministers grew. The revival of the sung Mass with an assistant deacon has been hailed as a happy restoration of an authentic tradition and we may even expect to see its use extended to other times of the year. When a second priest or a deacon is available, it is desirable that he should assist the celebrant in the simple rite.

COMMENTARY DURING THE RITES

One method of fostering an intelligent and orderly participation of the faithful in the sacred rites is the presence of a commentator who can direct the movements and responses of the faithful and direct their thoughts to the various themes of the rites by a discreet commentary.

The commentary should be brief and prepared in writing beforehand. Its aim is not to instruct the faithful on the meaning of the various parts of the rites or texts, that should be done at some other time, but merely to point out a theme. The commentary cannot supply for the non-use of a Holy Week book by the faithful. It is well to remember that the rites themselves have their own peculiar dramatic power, they are intended to appeal to the senses of the congregation as well as to their minds. The commentator must not, then, attempt to intrude into the sacred drama, his role is to direct the attention of the congregation to the sacred drama being enacted before them and in which they are taking part.

PERMISSIONS OF THE ORDINARY

The permission of the Local Ordinary is required for several matters:

(i) The blessing of the branches followed by the procession and Mass may be celebrated on the afternoon of Palm Sunday only with the permission of the Local Ordinary.

(ii) On Maundy Thursday, the Local Ordinary may allow, if necessary, one or two Low Masses in churches and public

oratories, and one Low Mass in a semi-public oratory, in addition to the principal evening Mass.

When it is not possible to have even the simple rite without chant (i.e. the Mass and the transferring of the Blessed Sacrament to the Place of Repose), the Local Ordinary may allow the same number of Low Masses as above.

The Local Ordinary may allow a priest who has charge of two or more parishes to binate on Maundy Thursday.

(iii) On Good Friday, the Local Ordinary may allow a priest who has charge of two or more parishes to repeat the solemn Liturgical Action, provided that this is done in separate parishes.

(iv) The Local Ordinary may grant permission for the anticipation of the Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday evening in certain circumstances which will be discussed below.

PROCESSION TO THE ALTAR

On Maundy Thursday and Good Friday the celebrant and his assistants are instructed to proceed to the altar *per ecclesiam.* Likewise, on Good Friday the deacon should follow the same route when bringing the Cross to the altar. The purpose of these directions is to give a more solemn character to the entrance of the celebrant. The entrance antiphon is intended to be sung during this procession of the celebrant to the altar. The possibility of arranging this entrance procession will depend on a number of factors which vary from church to church, but as far as possible the direct entry from the sacristy to the sanctuary should be avoided and the direction of the rubric followed.

FLECTAMUS GENUA

Throughout the Restored Order the rubric directs that all should kneel and pray silently for a short time after the invitation: *Flectamus genua.* After this silent prayer, the deacon (or celebrant in simple rite) says *Levate,* and all rise for the solemn prayer. How long should this silent prayer continue? At least for the space of a *Pater noster.* More important than the precise length of the pause is the understanding that it is meant to be a short silent prayer before the celebrant pronounces the solemn petition in the name of the Church.

PALM SUNDAY

The procession and Mass must follow the blessing of the branches. The procession is a 'public testimony of love and

gratitude to Christ the King' and the faithful should be especially exhorted to take part in it. After this Mass, a supply of blessed branches should be left in some convenient place in the church for the benefit of those who were unable to attend the procession. The branches should not be distributed at the altar rails except during the rite of blessing, and even then it is not necessary to distribute them to the people as they may hold them during the blessing. However, the branches must be distributed to the clergy and servers.

It will be noticed that in the simple rite the celebrant does not go up to the altar until after the procession, when he sings the concluding prayer facing the people. The blessing of the branches and the singing of the Gospel are carried out *in plano.*

In the simple rite it is permissible for a reader (or better readers) to read the Passion in English while the celebrant is reading it at the altar. A group of readers, following the division of the narrative according to the three parts, is usually considered preferable to a single reader, as this both adds solemnity to the reading and lessens the danger of monotony.

In the solemn rite, the Passion must be sung or read by the special deacons, or by the celebrant and ministers (provided that the sub-deacon is an ordained deacon). It is not permissible to have the Passion read in English at the same time, as the solemn rite itself provides for the solemn singing or reading of the Passion by the ministers at the altar.

The same rules are applicable to the Passion in the Good Friday liturgy.

ADORATION OF THE CROSS

The *Ordinances* issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites (February, 1957) allowed an alternative form for the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday to be used in larger churches, in which the personal Adoration of the Cross by each member of the congregation would be too difficult and unduly prolong the rite. The use of several crosses for the adoration would now seem to be excluded. The Cross to be venerated is that which was brought in solemn procession to the altar, unveiled before all, offered for their veneration and then enthroned upon the altar. The veneration, even collective, of all present is directed towards this Cross (cfr. C. Braga, C.M., *Monitor eccles.*, 1957, p. 235). After the Cross has been enthroned on the altar, it would

be incorrect to place it or another cross at the altar rails to be venerated by the faithful after the solemn Liturgical Action.

The correct understanding of this alternative form of the Adoration of the Cross has been outlined by Father Antonelli, O.F.M., Relator of the Historical Section of the Congregation of Rites. 'In regard to this direction, it will be useful to note that, in accord with the terms of the above-mentioned article of the *Ordinances,* this abbreviated form is allowed only where there is a genuine reason. This is so because it is beyond all doubt that the rite of the Adoration of the Cross marks one of the culminating points of the whole Liturgical Action, and that, both from the psychological and pastoral viewpoint, it is most desirable that each of the faithful be given an opportunity to make this personal and impressive contact with the Holy Cross. The abbreviation of the rite would certainly not be justifiable for the mere fact that the adoration by the faithful requires a certain amount of time. We should think rather of ensuring that the singing of the Reproaches and of the other texts indicated in the Order is properly prepared, at least where this is possible. Indeed, the precise purpose of these chants is to maintain the attention and devotion of the faithful during the time required for the sacred rite' (*Osservatore Romano,* 15th February, 1957).

The directions for this alternative form state that the celebrant must briefly invite the faithful to adore the Holy Cross before holding it aloft to be adored for a short time in silence. Commentators generally suggest that this brief invitation of the celebrant might be modelled on the similar invitation which precedes the Renewal of the Baptismal Promises in the Easter Vigil rite.

HOLY SATURDAY

A practical problem which frequently presents itself in connection with this day is the question of the anticipation of the Easter Vigil. Local Ordinaries are empowered to permit the Vigil rite to be anticipated in certain circumstances and for grave reasons. The terms of this power are clearly restrictive, hence it may be helpful to try to determine the mind of the legislator in the matter.

A correct solution cannot be found unless we first understand the nature of the Easter Vigil rite. Once again we may turn to the succinct and authoritative words of Father Antonelli. 'All

have not reflected sufficiently on the intrinsic nature of the Easter Vigil, which is the true celebration of the Resurrection of Our Lord, and not merely the celebration of a vigil in the modern sense of the word, i.e., understood as the preparation for a solemn feast, in the present case—a preparation for Easter.

'The Resurrection of Our Lord took place after midnight on Saturday and before dawn on Sunday. The Easter Vigil, of its nature, is a liturgical celebration which develops in an atmosphere of joyful expectation of the Resurrection. It is logical, therefore, that the function should begin on Saturday night and conclude in the small hours of Sunday, when Our Lord arose.'

The Easter Vigil Mass, which normally should begin about midnight, is not simply a parallel to the midnight Mass of Christmas. It is the second part of the one Vigil rite which extends from the Saturday to Sunday, and the earnest desire of the Church is that the faithful should assist at the whole rite. In practice, then, when preparing public notices for the rites it would seem more correct to avoid dividing the rite by presenting the Vigil Mass simply as a midnight Mass without relation to the first part of the Vigil rite.

In the light of these considerations we are in a position to understand better the terms under which the Local Ordinary may allow the Vigil rites to be anticipated. Instances will be found in which it would be almost morally impossible or extremely difficult to celebrate the rites about midnight, consequently the Church allows the rite to be anticipated lest the faithful be deprived of this opportunity of celebrating liturgically the mystery of Our Lord's Resurrection.

The Local Ordinary may not give a general permission for the whole diocese, or even for a particular area of it, to anticipate the Easter Vigil. He must consider each case on its own merits. The reasons for which he may grant the above permission are determined as 'grave reasons of a public and pastoral character'. A certain element of inconvenience will be found in every case because of the time, but this of itself is not sufficient. Other things being equal, we may say that, in practice, wherever we have a midnight Mass at Christmas, *a fortiori* the Vigil should be observed at the correct time. The converse, however, does not necessarily follow, because the law determines

the normal time for the Easter Vigil as about midnight, whereas the midnight Mass of Christmas has not the same obligatory character. Furthermore, two cases are explicitly mentioned in which a special effort must be made to observe the proper time for the rites, viz. Cathedral churches and religious houses. The exceptions, then, that may be made for grave reasons will serve to emphasise the general rule to be followed.

P. L. MURPHY,
St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

THE GOLDEN HEART, by John Beevers. Browne and Nolan, Dublin, 1956. 79pp. 5/-.

In this year of Lourdes, the little Walloon village of Beauraing makes its bow to English-speaking readers in Mr. Beevers' little book. From November 29, 1932 to January 3, 1933, Our Lady is alleged to have made 33 visits to a convent garden. The visions were seen by five children, four girls and a boy, who are all now happily married. At the time in Belgium there was very deep distrust of the children's story and the authorities seemingly frowned upon the excitement. Anyhow Omer Englebert was in favour of it and that put off many including the reviewer. Hence it is interesting to see that the Bishop of Namur, Monsignor Charue, well known in Scriptural circles, writes an approving foreword to this well written and illustrated book. The pilgrimages to the great Marian centres next year should not neglect the less well known, for instance Montaigu, near Louvain, whose main pilgrims are the Louvain students the night before the examinations. The streets and cafes are quiet that night. Erasmus in his time made his pilgrimage. So I suppose Montaigu ranks.

—T.V.

Homiletics

THE LESSONS OF LOURDES.

The great centenary of the epoch-making events, which have made Lourdes one of the holiest of cities and the greatest centre of Marian devotion and pilgrimage in the Catholic world is about to begin. An Australian National Pilgrimage is soon to leave our shores, to pay Australia's tribute to the Immaculate Lady of Lourdes during this year of celebrations. It is fitting, therefore, that those homely notes, which are the rough materials of homilies, should embrace the lessons of Lourdes.

The place itself has its lesson to give us. In 1858 Lourdes was a very out-of-the-way town of France, seldom visited even by tourists who sought the beauty spots of the Pyrenees. The events of 1858 made it famous. We cannot, indeed, presume to give the reasons which determine heaven's choice of a place in which God wills to make a special manifestation of His power. But we can show some special reasons of seemliness and becomingness. Lourdes, although, as we said, little visited by tourists a hundred years ago, is a beautiful place, and it was a mystery of heavenly beauty that was to be manifested there. Sinlessness is a thing of beauty and the only totally sinless, pure human creature was to show her heavenly beauty at Lourdes—the stainless beauty of Immaculate Conception. Anyone who has remained in Lourdes for some time, even for the few days of a pilgrimage, will feel that the Blessed Virgin knew how to choose her place. St. Bernadette could never find language to describe the beauty of the Lady who appeared to her at Lourdes eighteen times between February 11 and July 16, 1858. We, who go on pilgrimage to Lourdes cannot, like Bernadette, see her with our eyes, but the place itself, as it were, tells us that she *was* beautiful. Our lesson should be that there is no beauty like that in which God takes pleasure—the beauty of a pure, sinless soul. Lourdes should teach us to hate sin as ineffably ugly. This is a lesson to be learned at all times and especially in this age, when so many means are employed to make sin and sinners look beautiful.

Again, in choosing Lourdes, our Lady showed that she does not forget. Long centuries before (and always in a certain

sense) Lourdes belonged to the Marian domain of Le Puy, and a tribute of its verdant herbage had for centuries been sent, year by year, to the shrine of Notre Dame du Puy. At one time, even, the title of Countess of Lourdes had been given to the Queen of heaven, to show Lourdes' vassalage. In coming to Lourdes, therefore, our Lady was coming to a domain which the piety of the Franks had prepared for her since the ninth century. No, the Blessed Virgin does not forget.

The time also has its lesson. It is clear that, after the fearful upheaval of the French revolution, God wished to introduce a strikingly Marian age. It began with the revelation of the Miraculous Medal to St. Catherine Laboure, in 1830, in the very heart of the French capital. The revolutionary spirit that had sprung up in France disturbed Europe again in 1848. Meanwhile the Immaculate Virgin, "Mary conceived without sin," honoured by the Miraculous Medal, was moving with strong firm steps into the new life of the Church. The movement for the dogmatic definition of her Immaculate Conception was under way, and Pius IX defined the doctrine as a truth of Catholic Faith on December 8, 1854. Three years and slightly over three months later, on March 25, 1858, the Lady of the Apparitions at Lourdes, which apparitions had begun on February 11, declared to Bernadette: "I am the Immaculate Conception." No one could have thought of wording it that way except the one who was herself, by singular privilege, "the Immaculate Conception," the only child of Adam conceived without original sin. Lourdes thus established the wonderful nineteenth century bond between devotion to Mary and devotion to the infallible Magisterium of the Successor of St. Peter. The present marvellous influence of the Papacy and the marvellous unity of the Catholic world around the Papacy, is in a true sense, a fruit of the Apparitions of Lourdes.

God chose the place, He chose the time, He also chose the person. As St. Mark notes, when he narrates the event of the calling of the Apostles: "Jesus goes up the hillside and he calls whom he willed himself, and they went to him and he made twelve. . . ." God chooses whom He wills. We know furthermore that He loves "to choose the foolish things of the world, in order to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world, in order to confound the strong, and the contemptible things of the world, and those counted despicable and counted as

nothing, in order to bring to nothing the things counted as something." This happened at Lourdes, but the "little nothing" was a pearl of purity, innocence and unspoiled sincerity. She had in her from baptism that simple candour and honest courage which grace was to perfect, while it made her the intrepid witness of the message of the Immaculate.

On jeudi gras, the 11th of February, 1858, there was scarcely a family in Lourdes that was so miserably poor as that of Francois Soubirous and Louise Casterot. They had already brought into the world six children and two were to come later. Of the six, two had died in infancy, so that only two girls and two boys were surviving: Marie-Bernarde (Bernadette), Toinette-Marie, Jean-Marie and Justin. Bernadette was the eldest, having been born on January 7, 1844.

She was a frail child. Very early, severe asthma, from which she was to suffer all her life, began to torture her, the suffocation often being so great, that she seemed on the point of death. Though now 14 years of age, she had never gone to school. She could not read nor write. She passed for dull, and those who tried to teach her catechism found that she could take in very little and easily forgot much of that little. Such was the girl, whose name was to fill the whole world, because she was the chosen instrument of the Queen of heaven. But we must not exaggerate, Bernadette was neither talented, nor strong nor well-born, but she had something which could draw the predilection of heaven.

Bernadette's parents were good Christians, but not the sort that could easily get on in the world. Francois Soubirous was a miller and, when Bernadette was born, at the mill of Boly, her parents were in moderately easy circumstances. But Francois was somewhat lazy and easy-going and, above all, he was improvident. Neither was his wife, who loved her husband very dearly, a person who counted pennies. She, too, was rather improvident. Things went from bad to worse, and in 1858 the family lived in an old prison-house in Rue des Petits-Fosses, the old place of arrest at Lourdes, commonly called Le Cachot, a lock-up which is almost the equivalent of Black Hole. Certainly the Soubirous did not have what the world calls respectability. They were often hungry, too, and young Jean-Marie, seven years younger than Bernadette, was known to eat candle-grease

from funeral candles, to relieve the emptiness of his poor little stomach.

But, if the six people in the Cachot of 1858 did not have what the world values as ease and respectability, they had what the world too often miserably lacks, strong Christian faith. They knew what prayer was, and the family prayer together in the evening consecrated a consoling union of hearts joyful withal in the happiness of suffering borne with Christian fortitude. The lesson from these simple facts is easy to draw.

Bernadette had recently been with her foster-mother, Marie Aravant, at Bartres, about two miles from Lourdes, where she shepherded the sheep and recited her beads on the hillside. All her science was tied to the Ave and the beads. Marie Aravant tried to catechize her for First Communion. Though 14, she had not yet received the Bread of life, because of her asthmatic trouble. The attempt to instruct her was not very successful. The beauty of the girl's soul (who in her own words, "always loved little things") was however very evident. It shone in her face and in her great dark eyes.

The lesson is that virtue can lift up those who are in the most depressing conditions. It is not in abundance nor in comfortable circumstances nor in talents nor in the good opinion of men that the real treasure of a Christian is. Jeremias said it from the mouth of the Lord: "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, let not the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him who glories glory in this, that he understands and knows me, that I am the Lord who works what is kind and just and right on the earth; for in these things I delight, says the Lord" (Jer. 9:23f) Those fifty words of Jeremias St. Paul reduced to five: *Qui gloriatur in Domino glorietur.*

* * * * *

A full history of the Apparitions may be read in any of the many good books that tell the story of Lourdes. The substance of them and the lessons they convey are what interest us here.

They began on a Thursday, and the Blessed Virgin seems to have stamped Thursday in a particularly notable way. After the inaugural vision of Thursday, February 11, two other Thursdays were days of remarkable happenings. It was on

Thursday of Ember Week in Lent, February 25, that the water began to flow and it was on March 25, Feast of the Annunciation, and also Thursday in Passion Week that the Lady revealed herself as "the Immaculate Conception." This does not seem to be without significance, for Lourdes was, in an altogether unique way, to join devotion to Mary with the great central Catholic devotion of the Holy Eucharist. This evident mark of predilection accorded by the Blessed Virgin to Thursday, the day of the Blessed Sacrament, reminds us of the words of St. Pius X: "The unique glory of the sanctuary of Lourdes resides in this fact, that peoples from everywhere are drawn there by Mary to the adoration of Christ Jesus in the August Sacrament, so that this sanctuary, being at once a centre of devotion to Mary and a throne of the Eucharistic mystery, surpasses, it seems, in glory all the other sanctuaries of the Christian world" (Apr. 25, 1911).

Perhaps we should remark also that the great exhortations to penance were given on Wednesday and Friday of Ember Week, the first week of the penitential season of Lent. In a document as ancient as the Didache, Wednesday and Friday are marked as penitential days. Christian fasting on those days of the week would seem to have taken the place of the (presumably rare) pharisaic fasts of Monday and Thursday.

The first five Apparitions (February 11, 14, 18, 19, 20) seem to have been chiefly intended for Bernadette herself, but can suggest to all of us useful lessons of personal piety.

In the first Apparition and subsequently the Blessed Virgin carried (suspended on her right arm) and she also fingered a Rosary, which had white beads and a golden chain. Bernadette had her own beads in her pocket and, on sensing the supernatural, her first instinct was to use that beloved instrument of prayer. We are surely taught by this that "the beads on our person" should be a rule of our Catholic life. Our pockets must feel empty without the Rosary, and the touch of its globules should be a consolation to our fingers—consolation of course, is a thing of the mind, but the feel of the beads is a feeling that we are near the Blessed Virgin.

The first intimation of the approaching vision was a gust of wind twice repeated, leaving the trees unshaken but causing the eglantine on the grotto to move gently. The wind of

Pentecost, the gentle breeze that Elias heard at the Mountain of Horeb, the very name of the Holy Spirit reminds us that God must send forth His breath before a renewal of the face of the earth can take place. (Cfr. Ps. 103:30).

Bernadette raised her arm to make the sign of the Cross, but her arm was paralysed, she could not raise it. The Lady, using her own chaplet signed herself with the sign of the Cross. Then Bernadette also was able to make the sign of the cross, and all her nervousness vanished. Now all who knew Bernadette in later years testified that she made the sign of the cross with inimitable solemnity. It would be well for us to remember this, when negligence produces those queer little circles in the air which are supposed to be the sign of the cross.

The Lady counted the prayers on her beads, as Bernadette said the Rosary. She did not of course, say the prayers, but it seems to be accepted that the Lady actually joined in the Gloria Patri (the Papal Encyclical says as much). So we have a special incentive, a special and very cogent motive to make us put into that doxology: "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost," which is the very substance of our Christian worship, all the attention and dignity and devotion that we can command.

We shall have finished the lessons of the first Apparition, when we note that it took place at the time when the bells of Lourdes and the surrounding villages were ringing out the Angelus.

* * * * *

On Sunday, the Lady smiled as Bernadette furnished with a bottle of holy water approached and sprinkled the Apparition. The child was transfigured in ecstasy before the grotto, till her sister Toinette, alarmed at what seemed to be the appearance of death, got a neighbouring miller to remove her. It was on this day, it seems, that Bernadette first described the Lady (this was the name by which she called her: "the Lady"). She was always most emphatic about the Lady's beauty. When asked later, throughout the years, whether she was as beautiful as so-and-so, or so-and-so, she used to say "They can't make to it." This was her patois way of saying: "They are not in it. My Lady is beautiful . . . beautiful . . . more than anything." Tota pulchra es, Maria, et macula originalis non est in te.

The next three Visions can be summed up rapidly. On Thursday, February 18, Bernadette was accompanied by a friend, Mme Millet, and a pious Child of Mary, Mlle Peyret. They brought with them pen, ink and paper, in the hope that Bernadette would get a message from the Lady in writing. When she conveyed this request, the Lady said: "What I have to say to you has no need to be put in writing. Would you have the goodness to come here for fifteen days?" When Bernadette had answered "Yes," the Lady said: "N'ou proumetti pas d'esta hurouso en este mounde mes en aoute"—"I do not promise you that you will be happy in this world, but in the next." This word has caused the feast of St. Marie-Bernarde (Bernadette) to be transferred from her natal day, April 16, to February 18. On that day also the Lady, who looked lovingly on Mlle Peyret, signified that she was pleased with the presence of the two companions and intimated that others could come—many others.

The happenings at the grotto did not escape the notice of the infernal enemy, and on Friday he made his first attempt to upset the programme by frightening Bernadette. While contemplating the Vision the little seer heard sinister voices in a confused babel over the Gave—seeming at war with each other, crossing each other, addressing each other menacingly, and one dominant voice cried: "Sauve-toi! sauve-toi." The Lady frowned towards the Gave, and the infernal noise stopped. Satan was to try other means later, using misguided human agents. He does not sleep.

Saturday, February 20, the fifth day, was the beginning of "the crowds of Lourdes." It was the day that the Lady taught Bernadette a prayer for herself alone, giving it to her word by word. Bernadette said it every day of her life, but no one ever learned what it was.

* * * * *

The great central lessons begin on the first Sunday of Lent, but we must present them briefly. They are beautifully summed up in the papal Encyclical printed at the head of this issue of A.C.R.

On that Sunday, a physician, Dr. Dozous observed Bernadette very closely, watching her face and her movements, feeling her pulse, and ending with the conviction that "the finger of God was here." Bernadette told afterwards that the

sadness and the tears which the doctor saw passing over her face were caused by the change in the Vision. The Lady took her eyes for a moment off Bernadette and looked sadly into the distance; then, bringing her gaze back to the child, she said: "Pray for sinners."

This is the first great—very great—lesson of Lourdes. Christ Our Lord came on earth to seek and save what was lost. He came to call sinners to repentance. Consequently, the first and most necessary apostolic imitation of the Saviour of the world is to desire the conversion of sinners and to pray for sinners. Many are lost because there is no one who will pray for them.

Through the interference of the civil authorities, Monday, the first of Lent (Feb. 22), was for Bernadette a day of absence from the grotto. Her father had been intimidated, and had forbidden her to go. On Tuesday, however, the prohibition was lifted, and Bernadette received three secrets from the Lady, which she carried with her to the tomb.

On Wednesday, Bernadette, with tears on her cheeks and sobs in her voice, carried the message of the Lady to the crowds: "Penance, penance, penance." As Pope Pius XII remarks in his Encyclical, it was the same message as that which sounded on the lips of St. John the Baptist in the region of the Jordan, the same as that with which the Saviour began His own preaching: "Repent, do penance, begin a life that shows forth a change of heart."

On Thursday, Bernadette received the order: "Go drink of the fountain and wash in it." The first trickle of water then came from the corner to the left of the grotto, and Lourdes took its place in the line of the Pool of Bezatha and the Pool of Siloe. It is surely not a mere coincidence that next morning the Catholic world was reading at the altar the words of St. John's Gospel: "At that time, there was a feast of the Jews and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Now there is at Jerusalem a Pool at the Sheepgate, which is called in Hebrew, Bethsaida (Bethesda, Bezatha), having five porticoes. In these there lay a great multitude of sick people—blind, lame, crippled people, who were awaiting the movement of the water; for an angel of the Lord used to descend from time to time into the Pool and stir the water; and the first to go down into the Pool after the stirring of the water was cured of any disease he had, whatever it might

be." (Jn. 5). Thus, in the words of a Gospel text thousands of priests were telling congregations all over the world (in type and figure of course) the future story of the water of Lourdes. There is a great vein opened for the homilist here, for he can recall how frequently God has used water as the instrument of His mercies—maxima quaeque sacramenta in aquarum substantia condidit.

The tenth Apparition of Friday, February 26, was, as we have already noted, to give a message of penance: "You will kiss the ground for sinners." Many persons, who think that their piety is sensible and matter-of-fact, will consider themselves dispensed from practices like this. Certainly, we should not make public parade of such practices, but it will do us much good, if we get the habit of unostentatiously striking our breast like the publican and if we practise also, in the privacy of our rooms, the gesture which the Lady requested of Bernadette. It is not merely a feminine form of piety. At Lourdes, one prays with arms extended and kisses the ground quite naturally. It should, however, be a matter of interior devotion thus expressing itself, and not just formalism—"Ponet in pulvere os suum" says Jeremias, "si forte sit spes." Saturday and Sunday were the last two days of February. They were characterised by very different communications. On Saturday Bernadette noticed that at one moment the Lady seemed to stand in an attitude like recollection or meditation—deliberation, we should say. Then she said: "Go, tell the priests that a chapel must be built here." "Priests" is plural, and is a general term; it does not infringe on episcopal rights to decide when and where a chapel should be built within a diocese. But, if the Lady used the term "Priests," we can see once more the Eucharistic intention of the heavenly choice of Lourdes. Bernadette understood that she was to approach the Parish Priest of Lourdes, the formidable Abbe Peyramale. Look at his picture, and you will not be surprised that she feared him more than a gendarme. But imposing, severe, austere and brusque as he was, the Abbe Peyramale had a heart of gold. He took up the prudent attitude of reserve and spoke of conditions, but, actually, Bernadette's candour convinced him in a few minutes.

Sunday was a day of intimate communications, and no one ever learned what passed between the Lady and Bernadette.

The weeks to come, however, were to show that she had learned wisdom greater than anything human in the school of Massabielle. Many of the answers given by the child to interrogators are little miracles of the simple directness of truth.

Monday, March 1, saw an event, which the anti-religious press of the time horribly misrepresented in such atrocious terms as: "The pythoness of Lourdes poses as a priestess." The simple fact which was garbled was that the Lady insisted on Bernadette using her own beads, when, at the request of a friend, she was beginning the Rosary on a borrowed one—another exhortation to us all, to treasure that chaplet, which is, as it were, part of ourselves, and which we always carry on our persons.

On Tuesday, March 2, the request for a chapel, with the addition of "people coming in procession," was made once more. Abbe Peyramale asked the miracle of a winter rose. On the following day, March 3, the Lady only smiled at the request, "but," added Bernadette, "she wants the chapel."

Three weeks passed without Apparitions. No rendezvous for Bernadette at the grotto! But the child knew that the Lady had not said adieu. A supernatural impulse carried her to the grotto at an early hour on Thursday, March 25. The Lady was waiting for her. In an attitude of humility Bernadette said: "Madame, would you have the goodness to tell me who you are?" No answer, but a smile. Again the request was repeated, more humbly still, and the third time, in suppliant humility. The first two requests had been answered only with a smile. At the third, the Lady took an air of great gravity and seemed to humble herself. She joined her hands, raised them as a priest does at Mass and lifted her eyes towards heaven. Then, slowly disjoining her hands once more, she bent down towards the child and said:

"Que soy era Immaculado Conceptiou."

There were to be two other Apparitions (April 7, and July 16), but we shall end with this: We are at March 25, 1858. On the 8th of December, 1854, Pius IX. seated on the chair of his Supreme Magisterium had solemnly pronounced:

"For the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the glory and adornment of the Virgin Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the

Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by Our own authority We declare, pronounce and define that the doctrine which holds that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ the Saviour of Mankind, has been divinely revealed and must therefore be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful."

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Notes

THE NATURE AND METHOD OF SACRED THEOLOGY

Sacred theology is the science that the Church regards with great veneration, demanding by law of all who intend to become priests a fixed and formal course of study in it extending over a period of years. It forms the main part of the curriculum of ecclesiastical studies. It is a science with a rich diversity of features and varied in its content. It may be described briefly as the science of the word of God, which we are bound to believe and to preach. No science excels it in excellence or is equal to it in rank. Because of its distinctive superiority among the sciences it has been proclaimed, in the ages of faith, the queen of the sciences. It is divine in character by reason of its origin, as it springs from faith and is fostered by it. Being the science of faith it is practical in its outlook and relevant to life, for we may say that it is concerned with all that is on earth and in heaven. Its range could not be greater since no problem or difficulty bearing on human existence is excluded from its consideration.

Man's intellectual interests are in no way lessened by divine faith; he is not condemned to any kind of intellectual bondage or poverty of thought by believing in God. Rather, supernatural faith deepens man's insight and widens his horizon, for through it, he is brought into contact with a whole new world of things of which otherwise he would know nothing. Between faith and reason there is a close alliance. Unless a man uses his reason he can never believe and where there is flawless fidelity to reason, there is never a failure of faith. Reason is vitalised by faith.

The impulse that is in the human mind to reasoned thought can never be suppressed, and even when the mind is raised to a higher level through faith, this impulse remains unchanged. The mind always functions in conformity with its nature, obeying its laws with a certain simplicity and accuracy. Faith neither destroys nor detracts from what is good in the nature of anything. When things are not clear this instinct in the mind becomes more apparent, because it is uncongenial to the mind to be satisfied with any kind of easy simplicity. The specific intellectual satisfaction, tranquillity and security that faith entails, are not due to the creative energy of thought or action, but are the

gifts of God. Without an interior strengthening of the mind, faith would be impossible. Every supernatural mystery evokes a response in the mind and stimulates it to thought. No mode of apprehending truth saves it from the trouble of thinking, or puts an end to its investigations. Faith can never serve as a substitute for reason nor can it induce reason to renounce itself or abdicate its rights. To apprehend truth is not enough for the mind, which seeks to understand the inner primary meaning of everything. Although it is far beyond its power to attain a full comprehension of the supernatural mysteries of faith, it can, nevertheless, gain a certain knowledge of them. No more fruitful source of thought exists than divinely revealed truth, which instead of stifling originality stimulates it. With faith there is never any compelling evidence, for otherwise it would differ in nothing from vision. Being concerned of necessity with the unseen, its object is invisible and lacks noon-day clarity as far as the mind is concerned. Theology represents the mind's effort to comprehend and explain for itself things that belong to the realm of faith thus remedying as far as possible the incompleteness of understanding that is inevitable. With faith there is a new departure for thought, and theology is its outcome. In theology the mind is primarily directed to the implications and consequences of the truths of faith and to the hidden treasure of thought in revelation, the *scibile in credito.*

It is not just the subject matter or the kind of topics of which sacred theology treats, that gives it its unique character and makes it different from all the other sciences, but rather the light in which it views all things. Everything is considered in this science from the point of view of God either as He is known to Himself and to the saints in heaven or manifested to us in divine revelation. As such, He is not known to us except through faith. God's valuation of things does not correspond to ours, His point of view being something that we are unable to discover for ourselves. Moreover, scientific study does not aid us in the matter. In no other science does the light of faith play such a role as it does in theology. This is the science that reflects the fresh, living experience of faith; with a magnitude and splendour all its own. It has not, of course, the status of faith nor does it add to it nor extend its object. The word of God has an independent sovereignty over all that is contained in theology; being absolute and final, it cannot be analysed in terms of anything more final than itself. No art of man can ennoble it.

On the other hand, theology is far from being an attempt on the part of man to depreciate the word of God or to pass judgment on it. The word of God cannot be challenged or subordinated to our human ways of thinking. It widens to man's view with theological reflection. Theology instead of being a stumbling-block to the entry of the word of God into the heart of man is a help, and has the effect of deepening his insight into the truths of faith. There is more with it than intellectual enlightenment, since it fosters the necessary condition for the realisation of the word of God in the heart of man. St. Thomas intimates this when he writes: "The knowledge of God which is obtained through the *other* sciences enlightens the intellect *alone*, in showing that God is the first cause, that He is one, intelligent and so forth; but the knowledge of God which is possessed *through faith both illumines the intellect and delights the affections*, for not only does it tell us that God is the first cause but that He is Our Saviour, that He is our Redeemer, that He loves us, that He became incarnate for us, all these things inflame the affections" (11 Ad. Cor., C.2., lect. 3).

And again in another passage he says: "The doctrine of Sacred Scripture has this characteristic, that in it the matter is not proposed merely for speculation, as in Geometry, but also for assent by the will. . . . Thus *in other sciences* it *suffices* that man be perfected in respect to his *intellect;* but in *this* it is *required* that he be perfected both as regards his *intellect* and his *will*. . . . And because what is treated in Sacred Scripture (and in Sacred Theology) pertains to the will and not just to the intellect, man should accordingly be perfect in *both faculties*" (Ad. Heb., C.1, lect. 2).

Even though theology is the science of the saints still it is not just a science from heaven; it has characteristics that refer to space and time. A theologian can never afford to neglect the elementary foundations of his science. One of the first things he must do is to take account of his data and to make a proper assessment of it, for otherwise he cannot hope to be successful in the construction of a synthesis. Everything in theology is not of equal value—some truths are more fundamental than others. The revealed truths which belong to the supernatural order and constitute the articles of faith rank in the first place. But every truth contained in revelation is not supernatural or beyond the capacity of man's unaided reason to discover. The truths which constitute the preamble of faith, such as, the

existence of God, the immortality of the human soul, free will, the necessity of an end or purpose to human life, the worth of righteous living and so forth are part of the content of divine revelation and still they can be known by man apart from revelation. Since without a knowledge of these truths, faith would be untenable and the whole supernatural moral life impossible, they have been revealed by God to make faith, as it were, easy for all.

The theologian is concerned with the implications, mutual relevance and logical harmony of these truths. Theology, however, cannot be wholly identified with the deduction of conclusions from principles of faith and with whatever comes under that kind of reasoning, even though the conclusions drawn from the principles of faith constitute its object. The Church's teaching is a regulative factor in faith; the articles of faith are not discernible apart from the Magisterium of the Church, since nothing is of faith unless it is taught by the Church. A thorough knowledge of the Church's teaching in all its modes of expression is indispensable for the theologian. In theology, therefore, much preparatory work of research and estimating of evidence with regard to decisions of Councils, pronouncements by the Popes and so forth not to mention Scripture, the writings of the Fathers and other sources is necessary before there is question of any gain in the knowledge of the content of revelation. In no science is there the same need for a division of labour as in theology; and it is beyond the capacity of any one man to-day, no matter how gifted, to be thoroughly acquainted with theology in all its branches. Being so extensive it has a place for almost every kind of knowledge; besides philosophy, which is supremely important for it, it makes use of the sciences and other branches of learning, particularly history and historical criticism, which enjoy such prestige in the world to-day; even literary art is not without its value in theology.

No particular aspect of theology or study within it constitutes a science in its own right. The division of it into biblical, patristic, moral, mystical, apologetic and dogmatic, is only a methodological device without a foundation in the nature of the science itself. No matter what the problem may be, to which the theologian addresses himself, his guiding star is always reason illuminated by faith—the claims of faith coming first for him in all things. When he concentrates upon history it does not become a separate subject for him—the historical theologian

is not just an historian. This does not mean, of course, that he is less skilled in methods of exact scientific investigation and critical scholarship than a thorough-going historian; he is every bit as capable of the same high achievement in this field of research as the professional historian. But in all historical discussions he is aware of the autonomy of his science and that it is beyond the scope of the method of history to recognise its value.

There is a tendency to-day to attach more significance to history than it deserves and to reduce other sciences to terms of mere historical criticism. It is supposed that when one has explored the history of a subject one has said everything that can be said about it and exhausted its intelligibility. In some modern universities philosophy is identified with the history of philosophy. Nor has theology escaped! In our own time certain theologians have proved themselves unequal to the task of specifying with precision the difference between theology and history in points where they meet. Those who favoured what was called the New Theology maintained that there can be no accurate system of theology beyond what the witness of history allows us to establish; in theology the appeal must be all the time to historical evidence. They were opposed to any kind of dogmatic certainty or conclusions drawn from principles, holding that theology was nothing more than the study of an historical situation—the actual life of the Church in its members here on earth and must therefore be stated in terms dictated by the methods of history.

This excessive veneration for history and its methods led certain theologians of this trend of opinion to go further in their depreciation of sacred theology and become less guarded in their statements. They went so far as to say that the conclusions in theology were only tentative and had no permanent value. Those who advocated this position in published works found themselves in serious trouble with the Holy Office.

Theology and history are not on the same level, they are totally different and discontinuous. As far as speculative theology goes no one has any difficulty in admitting this for they look upon it as theology in the fulness of its splendour but it is not so evident as regards what they call positive theology. Now positive theology does not share less in the nature and character of the science of theology than speculative theology. There are not

two theologies; they form as it were an integral unity. The viewpoint of the theologian never varies whether he proceeds by way of induction or deduction, both methods having their place in theology. Compared with all the other sciences and branches of knowledge theology is of the purest of origin, being the science of revealed truth. The theologian is as sensitive as a compass-needle to everything that has reference to revelation. Never does he allow anything to intrude upon it or obscure it. There is a conservatism as well as an originality with him, everything he affirms he does so in the name of revelation. The element of novelty that is in theology is not wholly novel, the theologian always aims at preserving the inner thread of continuity between the content of his scientific thought and revelation, between what he proclaims new with the development of his science and what is divinely revealed.

Even when theology and history are in substantial agreement in their critical scrutiny of the past and in their solutions of problems of textual criticism and so forth, they are still far from being identified. The theologian has an unrivalled insight into things compared with the historian; his vantage point is always from above, for he judges with the unerring eye of faith while the historian has nothing only reason to guide him, and so things that are uncertain for him, disconnected and veiled in obscurity are not so for the theologian. The theologian is always able to go a step further than the historian by making history bear on issues that are far-reaching and that belong to the supernatural order. The positive theologian, as he is called, uses history in the service of theology in the same way as the speculative theologian uses philosophy. Everything in theology must satisfy the demands of its principles, because it is the divine element in it that is of central importance. It is only as an instrument, therefore, that history can contribute to the development of revealed truth and just as philosophy must have validity independent of theology to play its role, so likewise history must be authentic and true to be of any value in theology. When we say that theology is historical it is not to be understood that it is just a variant form of history or even that it finds its completion in history. The theologian is not moved solely by arguments that are historical, for historical premisses can never yield a theological conclusion. A conclusion in theology is quite unlike a conclusion in any other science because of the greater force and certitude that is with it.

Theology is not a purely rational science, even though it departs in no way from the methods of rational thought; it uses logic, for example, to the same extent as the other sciences and disciplines do. All the problems with which it is concerned have their origin in faith. The theologian's mode of approach to everything is by way of faith, he is not guided merely by the principles of rational demonstration but rather by reason as it acquires a new vigour and power of penetration through faith. Reason becomes more highly developed through faith; there is an expansion of reason with faith. Its grasp even of those truths that come within its natural range is more vivid and more closely related to life. For instance, such truths as one ought to honour and respect one's parents or one should always do good have a simple obviousness about them even for a person who is unaware that they are divinely revealed. But for one who has the faith they become the real motive interests of the spirit and the conclusions that follow from them always remain certain even when his insight into these truths is defective or when he doubts his competence to prove them by natural reason. Their divine origin and absolute validity is what counts for him.

The light of faith does not permeate reason in the same manner and degree with reference to all things; this, of course, does not take away from the unity of the science of theology. Everything cannot have the same clarity and distinctness for the theologian. Theology is complex in its method, for it is many-sided, it is scientific, historical and sapiential in character. Nor is it a comprehensive view of it to say that it is just a science, for it cannot be confined within the narrow limits of science. The clarity that is with it represents a certain penetration into the first and universal cause of all things, that is into the nature of God as He has revealed Himself to man, and where this deep understanding of God exists there wisdom is found. Theology is a wisdom, born of faith, enabling man to discern and judge of the things of God. "Sacred theology," says St. Thomas, "derives its principles not from human knowledge, but from divine knowledge, through which, as through the highest wisdom, all our knowledge is set in order" (1 q. 1 @ 7 ad 1).

The foundations of all knowledge are found in theology. This does not mean of course that all the other sciences borrow their principles from theology but rather that theology, as the

highest form of wisdom, secures the mental balance and stability that are necessary for scientific knowledge and technologies to be related to human life and action in such a way as not to diminish man's spiritual independence but to secure his glory as a child of God. All order is the outcome of wisdom. For the theologian God is the principle of order. That order is more than the adjustment of contrasts. It introduces into human life and experience significance, importance and refinement of perception. Theology which is wisdom pure and simple lends depth to human life. St. Pius X, who has been called the "Pope of Theology," says: "Truths of the supernatural order, of which the Church is the depositary, necessarily promote everything that is true, good and beautiful in the order of nature, and this is accomplished more efficaciously in proportion as these truths are traced to the supreme principle of truth, goodness and beauty, which is God" (Jucunda Sane, p. 527-528). Again he writes: "Human science gains greatly from revelation, for the latter opens new horizons and makes known sooner other truths of the natural order. It opens the true road to investigation and keeps it safe from errors of application and method. Thus does the lighthouse show many things which otherwise would never be seen, while it points out the rocks on which the vessel would suffer shipwreck" (Ibid p. 528).

IGNATIUS O'BRIEN, O.P.,
St. Dominic's Priory,
East Camberwell, Victoria.

Book Reviews

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL WRITINGS, by J. H. Newman. Edited by H. Tristram. Sheed and Ward. London. 1956. xi + 338 pp. 18/-.

It must have been thought in the 1870's that the last had been heard of Newman. He had around him the unlucky air of a man of thought lost in the practical politics of a new age. Nearly a century later the picture has changed. Not only English and American scholars are considering his works from all points of view, but in France and Belgium, notably, there is intense interest in Newman's theological, philosophical and scriptural ideas. The veteran guardian of Newman's papers, Father Henry Tristram, had prepared a complete collection of Newman's personal papers for publication. Father Tristram died in 1955, but pious hands have delivered these papers to the general public. For the first time a complete text has been printed of the papers which were consulted by Wilfrid Ward and Anne Mozley when they were preparing their books on Newman. Therefore, as the editor points out, most of the matter has already been seen in print, because particularly Ward quoted extensively; yet there is a great difference between reading extracts and seeing the original documents. The following documents are printed: (1) An Autobiography in Miniature (a curious collection of dates jotted down by Newman beginning in his schooldays and concluding 72 years later with the words: "And now a Cardinal. March 2, 1884."); (2) Two autobiographical sketches (two short accounts of his life for works of reference. They were written in the early period of 1860's); (3) The Autobiographical Memoir (pp. 29-107) (Newman's account of his early life and of his career at Oxford); (4) "My Illness in Sicily;" (5) Three early journals; (6) The Journal, 1859-1879; and finally the "Memorandum about my connection with the Catholic University." A document used extensively by Ward, but in Father Fergal McGrath's book, *Newman's University, Idea and Reality,* the interest and raciness of the memorandum were at once visible. The above documents are carefully edited with introductions and explanatory notes. The modern revolt from the formal, official 'Victorian' biography had its early prophets in William Mason's *Life and Letters of Thomas Gray* (1774) and, of course, James Boswell's *Life of Samuel Johnson* (1791) (not to mention, the curious, rakish *Nollekens and his times,* by J. T. Smith, 1828), all of whom aimed to allow the central character to express himself by letters and reported conversations. This was Newman's plan also. Perhaps it is the difference in approaching Newman through Ward's classic biography and through the simple (at first sight) Autobiographical Memoir. Once read, the Autobiographical Memoir will never be forgotten,

as it is to listen to Newman himself. It is to be hoped that this volume will be read widely. Newman scholars will appreciate it, no doubt, but this shy, Victorian figure, moving in a remote world with Whately, Blanco White, Pusey and Keble, has triumphed over the dim forgotten questions that occupied a few dozen dons by ability, goodness and artistry. Newman was the most shy of men; yet he kept journals (a Victorian mania) in which he knew his soul would be revealed for centuries to come. That is to say he was an artist. "I can read religious books, the most spiritual with great pleasure, and, when so engaged feel myself warmed to prayer . . . but let the appointed hour of devotion arrive, and I am cold and dead. . . ." And, again, ". . . the Saturday Review . . . said that I had disappointed friends and enemies, since I had been a Catholic, by doing nothing. . . . The only thing, of course, which is worth producing is *fruit*. . . . At Propaganda, conversions, and nothing else, are the proof of doing *any* thing. . . . But I am altogether different—my objects, my theory of acting, my powers, go in a different direction, and one not understood or contemplated at Rome or elsewhere. . . ." How lonely it is to be a genius! In the eyes of a Barnabo, Newman did nothing. *Fuit Barnabo;* Newman lives. That hard-bitten Ulster Protestant, St. John Ervine, in his recent book on *Bernard Shaw* had his usual hit at all things R.C., and in particular, apart from Newman and Ronald Knox, he questioned if any Catholic priest had written a line of any worth. The two Oxonians were educated in a different way and with different ideals, this he urged was the source of the glaring contrast. There is further good news contained in the volume under review as a new edition of Newman's books is promised. *Utinam!* Perhaps we came to Newman too young; we loved the garish too much and failed to appreciate the beauty of simplicity. *Senio confectus,* a man begins to pall when he reads the *mondain* journal of the Goncourts, for instance, while the quiet journal of Newman takes on a new light, where nothing seems to happen, and yet all is happening. Whatever one thinks of the absurd bias of St. John Ervine, it is very clear that Newman's works constitute a wonderful means of deepening knowledge.

T.V.

* * * * *

TOWARDS EVENING, by Mary Hope. London. Sheed and Ward. 1956. 178 pp. 10/6 stg.

When, in our adolescent years, we memorised *Rabbi ben Ezra*:

Grow old along with me
The best is yet to be . . .

we found it invigorating and idealistic; our delight all the keener because of the sub-conscious thought: Others will age, but not I. Even if I do, I shall remember this poem, and be serene and wholly lovable. Now, somewhat disillusioned, we still feel that Browning's Rabbi should be printed on leaflets for the edification of all who are grimly struggling with the arid study of geriatrics

and gerontology and the inescapable question: What shall we do with our old people now that we have so cleverly carried them over the biblical span?

Certainly no human being should mind facing old age if they have the spiritual and intellectual equipment of Mary Hope, who has generously shown us how she has solved the problem. Her book is a collection of journal entries for every day of one year; and we predict that it will be widely read, not only among those who are remotely facing age, but among Catholics who have to deal with the aged. People of other religions may read it with profit and comfort, but it is written by a Catholic for her fellow-Catholics. It is also attractive enough to win the interest of young people, who cannot learn too soon that the healing remedy of life's ills is spiritual rather than material.

In an entry for Pentecost Sunday we read: "I am thankful to have made the novena to the Holy Spirit. I doubt if any young person knows how, having passed middle-age convinced of one's ignorance as one's course, it becomes second nature to implore His guidance. He is the Comforter, especially in age, when one needs light and warmth and love: His attributes and the teaching of the Church on His indwelling heartens the lonely. To be in a state of grace is to have His companionship."

On every page of this beautiful book there are sentences that may be taken at random to nourish our idealism. Perhaps that word is not well-chosen, conveying (as it does sometimes) an air of unreality; whereas everything in this book has the true ring of experience. Thus, on kindness: "When I approach a situation gently, my mind remains clear. It seems to me that Christ was invariably specially kind to individuals whom He was called on to judge."

M.O.

* * * * *

THE CATHOLIC PRIEST IN THE MODERN WORLD, by James A. Magner. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. 286 pages. 48/6.

Cardinal Stritch in an honest foreword to *The Catholic Priest in the Modern World* states that there really can be nothing new on the subject of the Priesthood more than picturing the priest in changing conditions: "Dr. Magner in this book, in simple language, without pretensions to profound erudition, speaks of the priest in our country to-day."

Dr. Magner really writes about the priest of any country. He does not make many observations that have only local (U.S.A.) significance, nor is his literary approach in what has been termed the American idiom. Indeed, his priest is not ultra-modern, except perhaps for people who have been slow to realise the importance of social welfare work in the modern-day world.

His chapters on "Social Welfare" and "Counselling" are right up to date. For the remainder of the work the subject

matter is not so new, and is newly treated only insofar as the author recognises the ever increasing tendency of Catholics, with a lessening of faith, to be more critical of the priest.

Dr. Magner is at pains to put the priest on his guard concerning detail where disedification may appear before the people of to-day, where the priest may appear to deny his flock efficient and devoted service. He states his thesis on a high plane: "The following of Christ in the Priesthood involves far more than moral rectitude and blamelessness of life. . . . It is possible for a priest to pursue all the prescribed spiritual exercises at the same time as he is developing an insular mentality and anti-social eccentricities." The development of the thesis is very much down to earth, and his chapters on the "Priest's Personality," "Spiritual Life" and "Cultural Life" are sound and practical; but in applying his principles there are so many minutiae of what the priest must do and must not do that the reader becomes rather dust conscious.

The book makes no claim to be inspiring; but neither does *The Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass*, of Zualdi-O'Callaghan, which many priests read every year to revise detailed rubrics. Dr. Magner's book may be read on a similar basis, every year, to check on the details of priestly daily life.

The work draws freely on Papal pronouncements, on St. Paul, on Canon Law, and on too many writers who are not known here—we prefer to read in Father Magner's book what Father Magner has to say.

The author is no Father Trese; he has no flair for humour: his is the serious not the whimsical approach. Indeed, his is a most conscientious study, even to the detail of the size of the census card—he prefers a 5 x 8 folding card. He is a stickler for the penny (in the ancient world) catechism, even for converts; but in his suggestions for its use he does not indicate that he has heard of the Munich method. Surely, *children* of this modern world are not taught religion with the catechism used merely on a question-and-answer basis: does not the *story* (preferably biblical) come *first*, with an instruction to follow, which includes the difficult words and ideas which the children are to meet *later* in the catechism.

Mainly for the use of spiritual directors in seminaries, we presume, the book carries an exhaustive index, where the practical lecturer may find listed: gentlemanliness; humour, mis-placed; routine, value of; sleep, the importance of; but no reference to sputnik or satellite!

The last chapter, "Parochial Records, a commentary on the appropriate sections in Canon Law," is as sober as the whole work, and, say you, a most uninspiring finale. But you're wrong; because the last paragraph triumphantly reassures the priest "conscientiously fulfilling his duties down to the last detail" that he may "reasonably expect to hear the words, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' "

The blurb claims, "This book will give the priest a fresh perspective on his life and duties, holding up attainable goals which can be pursued through definite methods and procedures. Here is a book which will serve as a most useful guide to those who bring Christ to others." With the reservation that the emphasis of the book is on "methods and procedures" rather than on the Divine Model, we do not dispute the claim.

C.S.P.

* * * * *

AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY, by Daniel J. Sullivan. Milwaukee. The Bruce Publishing Company. 1957. 288 pages. Price 38/6.

The author is a member of the staff of the School of Education, Fordham University. He has set out to give a presentation that will serve as an introduction to philosophy for the general reader as well as for the student. He has succeeded in giving a very readable account of the principal problems of philosophy. Wisely, he devotes the first 50 pages to the historical rise of philosophy; then come sections on psychology, ethics, cosmology and ontology, this last including the ascent to God through causality. This book gives us a clear exposition of many of the fundamental questions of philosophy. We would like to see in it greater recognition of present-day problems, such as the philosophy of communism; also, the author could profitably have incorporated some of the ideas of recent Neo-scholastics, particularly those on the Continent. The book is well printed and produced and can be strongly recommended as an interesting introduction to human wisdom.

F.A.M.

* * * * *

PHILOSOPHICAL PSYCHOLOGY, by Rev. J. F. Donceel, S.J. Sheed and Ward. London. 1957. pp. 363. English price, 21/- stg.

This textbook of Psychology combines experimental and metaphysical aspects. It is usual in scholastic text books to give only the bare outline of empirical data. This book not only treats in detail the experimental background of the scholastic theses, but introduces valuable chapters, such as those on Psychoanalysis, which are not found in the usual courses of Scholastic Philosophy. Freud is given a full and valuable treatment (here and there points could be made clearer; thus the example on p. 308 of the jilted young woman who enters the convent might give the impression to outsiders that this is a common occurrence!). The author is not quite so successful in his evaluation of Jung, in that he does not seem to realise the pernicious nature of the latter's role for religion. For Jung, religion is merely a means of relieving tensions—there is no question for him of its absolute truth.

We are grateful to Father Donceel, who is Associate Professor

of Philosophy at Fordham University, for this valuable work of combining modern findings with the traditional Psychology.

F.A.M.

* * * * *

THE ELEMENTS OF LOGIC, by Vincent Edward Smith. The Bruce Publishing Company. Milwaukee. 1957. pp. 298. Price, 45/-.

This book covers the usual course of Formal Logic and deals with a few questions in Scientific Method. Where it differs from other works on the same topics is that it presents Logic in terms of case histories. The examples are all extracts from famous authors arguing on great issues, and they form an interesting collection.

While recommending the work, we would like to record our protest at the cost of this and similar American books. Such high figures must surely deter many Australians in their pursuit of knowledge.

F.A.M.

* * * * *

THE THING, by G. K. Chesterton. Sheed and Ward. London. 1957. 255 pp. 10/6.

The Thing was first printed in 1929. To the older reader, it is a comfortable return to Bishop Barnes, H. G. Wells, Sir Arthur Keith and Dean Inge. The old reader's memories, one would imagine, have had little to do with the plan of the publishers. They wish to attract fresh readers of a generation who perhaps are slightly irritated by their elders' habit of concluding a discussion with a quip from Chesterton, accompanied by a laugh. The snows of yester-year! Preachers speaking of oblivion should not forget modern times. Danton and Voltaire seem permanent, while Shaw and Hitler are disappearing rapidly from memory. Maurice Baring in 1913 wrote his still remarkable book *The Mainsprings of Russia*, and in speaking of the literary world, said: "There is in Russia no imaginative writer of the present generation who can be compared with H. G. Wells; no realistic novel as fine as Arnold Bennett's *Old Wives' Tale;* no writer as original as G. K. Chesterton." There is the opinion of a delicate critic. But what will the youth of 1957 make of it? Wells, Bennett and Chesterton! Wells, so Mr. Somerset Maugham smugly assures us, was left sitting on the river bank while the stream of success and influence swept by; Arnold Bennett told a tale, so he is bourgeois; and that leaves Chesterton. When all are dead who knew the wondrous youth and the gigantic figure of Fleet Street his books will remain. He will be judged by them. Of course, he wrote too much, "Essays written in fatigue to make a deadline," as Maisie Ward puts it in her introduction to this present edition of *The Thing*, but the old brilliance and verbal cleverness are something to wonder at. Verbal cleverness may seem weak praise, but one does long for the heart. Fresh and

young eyes will scan these sprightly essays on *The Thing*, namely the Catholic Church. Listen to the old master on: Why I am a Catholic. "A leading article in a daily paper was recently devoted to the New Prayer Book; without having anything very new to say about it. For it mostly consisted in repeating for the nine-hundredth-and-ninety-nine-thousandth time that what the ordinary Englishman wants is a religion without dogma (whatever that may be). . . ." Yet Chesterton goes on to say the same leader asserted that it was essential to be dogmatically Protestant. With some side-glances at the profound Protestantism of Mr. Michael Arlen and Mr. Noel Coward, he is convinced that positive Protestantism is dead, but the Protestant feud continues. As a young man he found that there was no longer any question of clinging to the Protestant faith. "It was simply a question of whether I should cling to the Protestant feud." Hilaire Belloc last year had one of his books set for the school examinations. One sincerely hopes Michael Arlen ends up as a scholarly note, tipped by all the illuminati. When one says Chesterton, something fine, manly, jolly and Catholic is thought of. That is a superb legacy to leave behind. So this little book gaily seeks a new audience. And what will be their verdict!

T.V.

* * * * *

MESSAGE OF THE MASS, by Dom Eugene Perez, O.S.B. An Abbey Press Publication. New Norcia. pp. 94.

In this small book Dom Perez sets out to proclaim the message of the Mass. The entire work is planned so as to fall into two sections of equal length. The first part is devoted to a doctrinal study of the liturgy. It develops a series of themes which provide a valuable background for the understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice. The reader is introduced to the notions of liturgy and worship, religion and sacrifice, the Christian priesthood, the Christian sacrifice, the liturgical cycle, the Mass and the Church, the mysteries of Christian initiation. The section concludes with an outline of the Mass ritual of the first century. The second part is a study of the Mass itself from the vesting to the Last Gospel.

Dom Perez is to be congratulated for presenting his readers with a complete picture of the liturgy of the Mass. Many of his statements are open to criticism, but the author is well-read and writes with great sincerity. Unfortunately the misprints are numerous, and several foot-notes have wandered into the body of the text.

C.T.

* * * * *

THE CHURCH TEACHES, by members of the faculty of St. Mary's College, Kansas. B. Herder Book Co. pp. 400.

God has given to his Church a living teaching authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith.

The aim of this book is to present the most important of the Church's pronouncements which constitute an authentic interpretation of revealed truth. It may be described, briefly, as an English Denziger with a difference. The documents are arranged so as to correspond to the classical tracts of theology. We are presented in turn with the Church's teaching on the True Religion, the Church, the Trinity, God the Creator and Sanctifier, the Incarnation and Redemption, Grace, the Sacraments, the Last Things. Each document is prefaced by a brief introduction which places it in its historical context and gives a short summary of its contents. About one quarter of the items contained in Denziger are reproduced for the benefit of the English reader; in addition, the authors have managed to include selections from more than 100 documents which are not found in the Denziger collection. The value of the work is enhanced by a series of indices, and the printing is excellent.

C.T.

* * * * *

A RIGHT TO BE MERRY by Sister M. Francis (Poor Clare Nun). London: Sheed and Ward. 212 pp. 1957. 12/6 Stg.

In recent years contemplative Orders have become articulate, having wisely given to gifted writers in their communities the task of explaining their vocation to an obtuse but enquiring generation. The Poor Clares in U.S.A. have found a good publicist in the author of this book. Evidently still in her thirties she writes with verve and humour; as she matures she should write with less self-consciousness and be all the better for that. Under vivacious descriptions we feel her deep appreciation of her vocation: the chapter of Poverty could be read with profit by any religious. Before she became a nun she was a writer of plays and poems, a teacher of ballet—altogether an artistic and fastidious girl. Conventual life has not deadened her sensitivity. Writing of poverty she remarks that Lady Poverty would not have dirty finger-nails, nor would she like ugliness about the monastery. And so, says our twentieth-century American Poor Clare, "we have planted a flowering tamarisk in front of our home-made incinerator."

The monastery described is a foundation in New Mexico, made by a group of nuns from Chicago, in 1948. Although jokes from a nunnery do not export well, we enjoyed that moment when a young nun squeaked: "O Mother what will we do with this case of beer?" Some well-meaning relatives had given it as a farewell gift to the nuns at the railway station, and it was only discovered after the train had moved out.

From what we hear of some houses of European contemplatives, they could receive many lights on the training of novices from such communities as the one we read of in this book. The postulants learn a ballet which they dance before the Christmas Crib, and they stage plays in the novitiate. Yet they never eat

meat; and they rise for office at mid-night. There is no evasion of the Rule, but there is a salutary recognition of the vitality and exuberance of most twentieth-century postulants.

The author can turn a felicitous phrase where imagery gives truth a timeless beauty, as when she remarks that a fervent nun "is a happy pilgrim moving through the lanes of creation to the shrine of the Most Holy Trinity."

—M.O.

* * * * *

COVENTRY PATMORE by E. J. Oliver. London: Sheed and Ward. 208 pp. 1956. Australian price from E. J. Dwyer: 20/9.

When Browning wrote to his fellow-poet, Coventry Patmore, during their friendship: ". . . The many years which have gone by since I first became acquainted with you have in no way altered my impression of the genius that came on us all by surprise in your first volume," he was referring to Patmore's long narrative poem, *The Angel in the House*. Most of us have become so cerebral in our poetic tastes, that we can hardly bear to read Patmore's long poems. After reading this biography by E. J. Oliver (a new name among English Catholic writers) we have become so interested in Patmore's life and times, that we are ready to read a later volume of his poetry, critically examined, by the Catholic writer of New Zealand, J. C. Reid. The book under review is a much smaller volume, though the writer wisely gives space to some of Patmore's shorter poems.

Nearly every anthologist of nineteenth century English poetry shows enough discernment in his choice to include some of these poems, chiefly *The Departure* ("It was not like your great and gracious ways!"); *A Farewell* ("With all my will, but much against my heart/We two now part."); *The Azalea* ("There where the sun shines first/Against our room,"); *The Toys* ("My little son, who looked from thoughtful eyes"). These are all fine poems, dignified in sentiment and rhythm by a timeless quality that preserves all true art.

When we meet people who remember meeting Gerard Manley Hopkins, a close friend of Patmore, we feel that we are not so far away from the Victorians. Yet, in our outlook, what worlds away! Patmore's biographer reminds us that the poet matured in a world chiefly influenced by Ruskin and Emerson. Contrasting the interest in the Church shown by Ruskin and Patmore, we are reminded again of Chesterton's remark on Ruskin: "He seemed to want every part of the Cathedral except the altar." How true. But it was towards the altar that Patmore went: he became a Catholic in 1864, the year after the death of his first wife. His destiny was evidently to seek happiness (and find it) in married love, each of his three wives being an inspiration to his writing. He wrote *The Angel in the House* under the inspiration of the first, *The Unknown Eros* of the second, and his mystical prose work of the third.

His biographer tells of Patmore's passionate friendship for Alice Meynell, happy wife and devoted mother of a rollicking family. Meredith was equally enmeshed in her charms. But, as our biographer remarks, "she was irreproachable, and there is sometimes a moment when a woman has also to be unapproachable." She broke off her friendship with Patmore, who probably realised as well as she that an intellectual passion has its own very real dangers.

—M.O.

* * * * *

CITEAUX AND HER ELDER DAUGHTERS by Archdale King. Burns Oates, London, 1954. 411 pages. Australian Price 48/6.

This is a chronicle of Citeaux, the abbey in which the Cistercian Order began, and of the four abbeys first founded from it, La Ferte, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond.

Mr. Archdale King follows the history of the five houses under each of their successive abbots. It is a story of difficult, even heroic beginnings in adverse natural conditions, and of great good done; then of a more settled state, but with its own difficulties and tensions, strained relations with powerful neighbours, with the government, with other Cistercian Abbeys, disunity within the abbeys themselves, leading to relaxation and reform. The end was reached in 1790 when the French Revolution dissolved the communities, confiscated, sold, or destroyed the buildings and grounds and furniture. Citeaux alone rose from the dead; one hundred years after the Cistercians were ordered out of their monastery, they returned and Citeaux once more has its abbot-general.

Mr. King's narrative is severely restricted as he follows five abbeys separately through 700 years of existence, but it contains most of the events characteristic of monastic history. You see the reputation gained throughout the neighbourhood and far beyond by the austere lives of these White Monks: the damage wrought by quarrels within the Order; the scourge of the commendatory abbot, the destruction of buildings in the religious wars of the 16th century, the low vitality during the 18th century before the great crisis of 1789, the occasional luxury-loving monk, the grim and successful struggle to make sterile land productive. Perhaps it was all too successful in a world where ecclesiastical wealth is a special source of scandal to the covetous. The 9800 acres of land which comprised Citeaux had been assessed by a Royal Commission in 1768 to bring in 70,000 francs a year—this at a time when a curate's annual salary was 300!—and they were sold for 862,000 francs.

With so much to tell in so small a space Mr. King yet records that in 1712 the cloisters of Citeaux were whitewashed.

There are several interesting photographs and drawings.

—V.M.

READY NOW !

Sole Official English Edition of . . .

The Apostolic Constitution

SEDES SAPIENTIAE

and the

GENERAL STATUTES

of the

Sacred Congregation of Religious

These monumental documents refashion the entire system of education for religious clerics, adapting the whole formation program to the needs of modern times. The keynote of what His Holiness Pope Pius XII states and promulgates as law in these documents is a unified development of the religious apostle in the face of the demands laid upon religious clerical life to-day.

Knowledge of the new legislations is a MUST for every religious priest and cleric. The documents reveal the richness of the priestly life in the religious state.

Other priests and seminarians can gain an insight into the sublimity of their own vocation in this masterpiece of the Church's law.

Religious Brothers and Sisters will find much in the **Apostolic Constitution and General Statutes** that has a deep reaction on their own particular State of Perfection.

Paper bound : $1.00

Cloth bound : $1.50

plus postage

One hundred and four pages, three Indices.

Write for a proforma invoice.

Exclusive Distributor :

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS

620 Michigan Avenue, N.E.

Washington 17, D.C.